

LIBRARY
WESTERN THEO. SEMINARY
HOLLAND, MICHIGAN

The REFORMED REVIEW



The Reformed Church in America

A Quarterly Journal of the
WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Holland, Michigan

January, 1957

Volume 10

Number 2

The Reformed Review

Volume 10 HOLLAND, MICHIGAN, JANUARY, 1957 Number 2

A Quarterly Journal of the Western Theological Seminary

THE MINISTER AND "MISPLACED" GUILT	Lars I. Granberg 1
THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN	Lambert J. Ponstein 10
PHILIPPUS JACOBUS HOEDEMAEKER	James C. Eelman 17
SHEOL: ITS CONCEPT AND SIGNIFICANCE	Charles P. Johnson 32
CAMPUS HIGHLIGHTS	39

BOOK REVIEWS

The Cross in the Old Testament, by H. Wheeler Robinson	Henry Voogd 41
Luther's Work, edited by Jaroslav Petikan	Lester J. Kuypier 42
Jesus Christ the Risen Lord, by Floyd V. Tilson	Richard C. Oudersluys 44
Taught by the Master, by Clarence W. Cranford	Rod Jackson 47
The Man Who Would Preach, by Robert E. Keighton	Garrett Wiltedink 48
The Early Church by Oscar Cullman	Thomas Boslooper 48
The Apostolic Fathers, translated and edited by J. B. Lightfoot	Sylvio Scorza 51
The Presbyterian Enterprise, edited by Maurice W. Armstrong, Lefferts A. Loetscher, and Charles A. Anderson	William W. Jellema 52
The Story of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., by Benjamin J. Lake	William W. Jellema 52
The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, by Norman H. Snaith	John E. Busman 53
The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr, by Hans Hofmann	John A. Vander Waal 54
The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, by George S. Hendry	Daniel H. Fylstra 55
Christelijke Zielszorg in het Licht der Moderne Psychologie, by G. Brillenburg Wurth	Jerome De Jong 56
Fifteen Hundred Themes for Series Preaching, by William Goulooze	Henry Bast 58
I've Been Wondering, by Fayley H. Cothern	Jerry A. Veldman 58
Luke the Physician, by William M. Ramsay	James I. Cook 59
The Reformed Pulpit	Chester J. Droog 60

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Lester J. Kuypier	D. Ivan Dykstra	Roderic Jackson
Richard C. Oudersluys	Henry A. Mouw	John Busman
Elton M. Eenigenburg	John den Ouden	Henry Ten Clay

THE MINISTER AND "MISPLACED" GUILT

LARS I. GRANBERG

GUILT: AN AREA OF TENSION BETWEEN MINISTER AND PSYCHIATRIST

Guilt is an area of human experience over which ministers and psychotherapists (i.e., psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts who treat emotional disorders through a person-to-person relationship often referred to as "counseling") seem to lock horns. To the minister the presence of guilt feelings in a person is considered a sign of awakening moral sensibility, a precursor of moral and spiritual growth. Just as pain heralds the return of life-giving circulation to the frost-bitten foot, he reasons, so the painful awareness of one's own reprehensibility increases the likelihood that a person will come to God in contrition and repentance seeking the forgiveness which is offered to him through Jesus Christ. A sense of guilt has made the individual more open to the claims of the Gospel.

The psychotherapist does not regard the experience of guilt as an unmixed good. He is often distressed by the readiness with which the minister takes a person's account of his culpability at face value and proceeds to minister to him accordingly. What troubles him is his conviction that frequently this ready acceptance of the person's statement of his problem fails to come to grips with the person's real problem. Instead he is being helped to dodge the issues, which is compounded by apparent religious sanction for concealment of the root problem and concern with the wrong issues of his life. With the perspective on guilt which his professional training has made almost automatic, it is little wonder that the psychotherapist is inclined to interpret the minister's readiness to accept the person's story as fact as naive and his efforts to elicit confession of sin and repentance as "moralistic," i.e., a readiness to condemn without a proper hearing.

To answer the question, "Who is right?" with the answer, "Both!" seems like equivocation. Nevertheless this is the right answer, for two problems are involved centering around the relationship between *guilt as fact* and *guilt as feeling*.¹ It is commonly assumed that the latter follows the former as night follows day, but it has been one of the important contributions of the psychotherapist not only to demonstrate that these are not necessarily related (a fact not unknown to the church, viz., the literature on "scrupulosity") but to shed considered light on why these are not necessarily related and how they come to be unrelated. That they are in fact not necessarily related is not difficult to demonstrate. One man may

¹For a more extensive discussion of guilt as fact and guilt as feeling see chapter 3 in Lewis J. Sherrill, *Guilt and Redemption* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1945).

lie, rob or murder without suffering pangs of guilt; another who discovers that he has inadvertently short-changed a customer a few cents becomes preoccupied with this mistake. He can think of little but his culpability. These reactions seem almost a universe apart, but they can dwell side by side in the same person. For example, several years ago a university student was apprehended by the police and subsequently convicted of murder. It developed that he had murdered two women and a little girl. The murder of the little girl was especially gruesome in that it involved his strangling her, cutting her body into pieces, and disposing of the pieces in catch basins and sewers. Yet he spoke of these murders to the police with a detachment one would expect of someone narrating one of Poe's horror stories. Later he told a reporter that he had no feelings about these murders at all.² But when he was interrogated about his dating activities he reluctantly confessed to having kissed girls at their insistence while on dates, manifesting acute shame and embarrassment about these activities. In this instance the distance between guilt as fact and guilt as feeling is obvious, and the fact that there are pathological roots underlying this distance is only slightly less obvious. In most situations this disparity is not so obvious.

What is involved in this disparity? The psychotherapist, who meets this problem regularly in his patients, speaks of *normal guilt* and *neurotic guilt*.³ He speaks of normal guilt when (1) the guilt is based on fact, i.e., he has violated a law of his society or has fallen short of what his life commitments demand of him; (2) his guilt reaction is proportionate to the severity of his offense; and (3) his guilt subsides after there has been proper forgiveness and restitution. Normal guilt is largely involved with the conscious levels of the personality. It is this kind of guilt with which the minister's training and outlook has ordinarily equipped him to deal. Thus it falls properly within the sphere of that form of ministration of the means of grace traditionally associated with the pastor's work with penitents.

However many of the pastor's most stubborn problems involve persons who often experience a marked disparity between their objective guilt and the intensity of their subjective guilt feelings. The feeling of guilt is disproportionate to their offense both in intensity and in duration. Usually such a person cannot understand why they should over-react so. When he seeks the pastor's help, it soon becomes apparent that he does not respond like most people do to the Biblical promises of forgiveness, justification and peace with God for the contrite. He may get temporary release, but he soon finds himself nagged by guilt feelings. After a number of such sessions with the pastor with no permanent release, he may con-

²Lucy Freeman, *Before I Kill More* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1956).

³For a more extensive treatment see O. H. Mowrer, *Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics* (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), chapter 19.

clude that either he has already exceeded the bounds of God's forgiving grace so there is no longer any hope for him, or he may decide that there is little to the Christian faith after all.

Since persons who are troubled in this manner often get little or no help from standard methods of pastoral care, a considered modification seems in order. I should like to suggest two lines along which the modification can profitably proceed: (1) through a more adequate understanding of the formation and expression of neurotic guilt trends in the personality; and (2) through the creation and skilled use of a "therapeutic atmosphere."

THE FORMATION OF NEUROTIC GUILT TRENDS

It has been said that the most important psychological concept of this century is the concept of the unconscious, i.e., that there are active, striving aspects in the personality about which an individual may be partially or totally unaware. Through his work with psychiatric patients, Freud discovered that troublesome behavior often proved to be a symptom of some deeper disturbance in the personality. Long ago the self-protective tendency in the personality learned to deny from conscious awareness (repress) certain experiences because of their painful, guilt-producing or humiliating impact. For example, a young child may resent what he considers to be harsh or neglectful treatment from a parent. At the same time he knows that whatever nurture he does receive comes from that same parent. Thus he fears that if his resentment is perceived he will probably lose the modicum of love he now receives. Quite likely he will also see himself as an ungrateful recipient of past favors, which makes him feel guilty. Hence he is likely to repress his resentment whenever it arises. His conscious experience will then be a kind of "free-floating" combination of guilt and anxiety.⁴ He feels frightened and guilty and cannot understand why he should. The guilt and anxiety (apprehensiveness) are now dissociated from the feeling which originally brought them into being. Since no one can long tolerate the idea that his reactions are irrational, he will tend to explain this guilt to himself in terms of some obvious minor infraction or a failure to achieve some unrealistic goal. He *displaces* his load of neurotic guilt onto these situations. In this way he explains his feelings to himself, but he also brings about these disproportionate and puzzling guilt reactions.

Why is this disproportionate reaction so rare in many persons and so typical of others? Briefly, it arises as follows:⁵ the infant first learns the rules for living through encouragement or correction from his parents (or parent-substitutes). This education of his conscience always takes place

⁴Rollo May, *The Meaning of Anxiety* (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), chapters 4-6.

⁵For the development of the concept of "basic anxiety" see Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1937).

in an emotional context. One child finds the emotional climate in which he is nurtured and disciplined a warm and approving one. Another finds himself in a reproving and demanding emotional environment, one in which the child learns to feel on trial, constantly having to prove himself worthy of the love of his parents.

The child who has grown up in an emotional climate of warmth and approval comes to think of the world as a friendly, predictable place. It has not been necessary for him to prove himself worthy of the love of his parents. They loved him because he was their child and because he needed their love. His mistakes and misbehavior were dealt with in a context of fundamental approval. He did not feel that the love of his parents was at stake, for their disappointment and disapproval was transitory and appropriate to the offense. Such a person gains courage to face his wrongdoings and to respond realistically and appropriately to them. His conscience is oriented toward good rather than away from evil.

This kind of emotional climate for the nurture of children is not always possible. All parents are not able to love their children freely and warmly, because of the residual inner tensions left by their rearing. Most likely they themselves were reared in a context of "conditional love" (paradoxical as that term may be!), a love which implied "I will love you *if*"—(If you respond quickly to training; if you are quiet and not a bother; if you do better work in school than the neighbor's children, etc. *ad inf.*). The emotional tone in such a home is troublesome for a child. It is characterized by many demands, a liberal dosage of disapproval, thinly interspersed from time to time with what is at best a qualified approval. Disapproval is communicated to the child with his meals, his bath, his learning of new skills. The impact of this atmosphere of disapproval is to cause the child to infer that there is something fundamentally wrong with him. He is just bad. He can do little or nothing right. Seemingly if he could only be perfect in performance, he could probably please his parents, but he does not seem to be able to measure up to this standard. Therefore he is worthy not only of the disapproval and punishment he actually receives, but much more beside.

Alongside this reaction is another reaction which complicates the picture. Partly because there seems to be in each individual an intrinsic sense of one's inherent dignity and worth, and partly because the child senses that other children no more skilled or better behaved than he are not pressured to produce in this way, a fierce resentment often wells up toward those whom he regards as the source of his sense of worthlessness and hopelessness. These feelings of hostility toward those upon whom he is also dependent frighten him. His efforts to rid himself of his resentment bring on neurotic anxiety and guilt as described above. The person sees the world as primarily unfriendly, demanding, coercive and punitive. He sees himself as hopelessly inadequate and deserving of punishment. Hor-

ney has called this outlook *basic anxiety*.⁶ She has come to see this pattern of attitudes as the matrix for most human immaturity and emotional disturbance.

LIVING WITH NEUROTIC GUILT TRENDS

When a person suffers from basic anxiety, he feels essentially alone, unwanted, vulnerable and frightened. What is more, he feels as though there is no help for him. It seems useless to hope that things can ever be otherwise. Living becomes for him the erection of psychological defense systems which he hopes will defend him from the hurtful intent of others and keep him feeling reasonably safe. These security operations take many forms, depending in part upon whether the person is most aware of his hostility, his anxiety, or his guilt feelings. Since this present discussion is concerned with those suffering from neurotic guilt, we shall proceed to examine several related traits often encountered by the pastor in his dealings with such persons. These include the effort to appear irreproachable, chronic self-reproach, disparagement of others, and an aggressive self-righteousness.

The effort to appear beyond reproach is a direct response to the demanding, disapproving atmosphere in which he is nurtured. This context produces in the person a harsh, perfectionistic, demanding conscience which has been called the "prohibitive conscience."⁷ The prohibitive conscience is oriented to avoid evil rather than to achieve the good. It primarily fears making a mistake or falling short of perfection. Since it is impossible to achieve the perfection demanded by the prohibitive conscience, and since it is painful to suffer the harsh self-reproach called forth when the person fails to satisfy his prohibitive conscience, he resorts to subterfuge. If he can maintain a facade of infallibility by avoiding the *appearance* of evil, he can quite probably lull his conscience into relative inactivity. In order to do this, he becomes scrupulous about the letter of the law. He meticulously observes all duties and regulations in any way binding upon him. Often he appears to go the second mile in his efforts at rectitude by imposing sterner measures upon himself than his commitments call for—e.g., if it is customary for good church members to tithe, then he must give twenty per cent. This same unbending rigidity is seen in his compulsive (externally driven) attitude toward being present at every church meeting; his tendency to run his devotional exercises by the clock; and otherwise to bolster up his activities, religious or otherwise, by similar external supports.

Even an elaborate network of external props is unlikely to guarantee infallibility, so a second line of defense is necessary. This usually takes the form of chronic self-reproach. He has learned that if he accuses him-

⁶Karen Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth* (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1950), p. 18.

⁷John G. McKensie, *Nervous Disorders and Religion* (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1951), lecture 4.

self before anyone else does, if he makes this self-accusation more drastic than others would, and if he is harsher with himself and more remorseful than the occasion really demands, two things happen: first, his pervasive sense of guilt over just being his finite and fallible self is temporarily relieved by having some concrete basis for his guilt feelings for which he can make amends; and second, when he is disproportionately harsh with himself, others will reassure him that he is really quite a good fellow after all, that he is being too demanding of himself, and that he should not be so overly conscientious. This reassurance is balm for his crippled ego. It also allows him the luxury of wallowing in self-pity for a while. But alas, its soothing effects are all too transient.

As an additional prop to his fragile self-respect, the guilt-ridden person finds disparagement of others a useful tool. As Sullivan once expressed it,⁸ by belittling others the person seems to find comfort in the implication, "At least I'm no lower than the rest of the swine." He seeks to assuage his sense of worthlessness on a sort of "misery loves company" basis. As such he never gives unqualified approval to anyone's efforts or character. He becomes an expert critic-about-town as he systematically discredits, detracts, casts aspersions and otherwise depreciates others.

Perhaps the most annoying characteristic found in some sufferers from neurotic guilt is an aggressive self-righteousness. Here the pious works he cultivates in order to support his appearance of infallibility become an instrument of aggression. He is often an avid Bible student, and he can quote freely from it. His vocabulary abounds with biblical and devotional phraseology. But these people are inclined to use their knowledge of the Bible, devotional literature and theology to put others at a disadvantage. Not infrequently such persons set themselves up as a kind of "watchdog" over the pastor and other church leaders, particularly if their own brand of spiritual eminence seems to be insufficiently recognized. The pastor or other congregational leaders are apt to be ruthlessly criticized on the grounds that they are unethical or ignorant of the deeper spiritual truths. There is sometimes a tendency to embrace extremist movements, or to go all out for some extreme approach to biblical interpretation. These are used as prestige devices and to win disciples, for in gaining a personal following the person's claims to superior righteousness is confirmed.

What we see, then, in all of this is a person who is desperately unhappy. He is troubled by self-accusation, by an intense need to be above reproach, by the need never to err. Most seriously, he is crippled in his capacity to give and to receive love. He may express all or only some of the traits described above, depending upon whether he is by temperament rather active and aggressive or passive or withdrawn. He does not usually respond well to the traditional pastoral methods.

⁸Harry Stack Sullivan, *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry* (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1953), especially chapters 12 and 13.

THE PASTOR AND NEUROTIC GUILT

In dealing with such persons it is necessary for the pastor to bear two things in mind. First, that such people are lonely, frightened people. Their more cantankerous qualities are an effort to rationalize in an *a posteriori* fashion some frightening and uncomfortable feelings and to find some release for these. Like the apostle, they "do not understand [their] own actions . . ." (Rom. 7:15). One obvious necessity, then, is an approach which helps these people to release their feelings without hurting others and which enables them to let go their own defenses and examine these painful areas of their lives.

It is also necessary to bear in mind the "love-crippled" state of these people. Their early love experiences were always conditional. This has caused them to proceed on the implicit assumption that love is only offered with certain painful strings attached. It is trying for the pastor to find his most earnest efforts to be warm, understanding and supportive evoking merely wariness and suspicion in his parishioner as though he were asking, "What's the gimmick?" The thoughtful pastor will see that this wariness is also found in the person's relationship to God: he may be able to give an excellent verbal explanation of justification by faith and the doctrine of grace; he may understand it well enough at the intellectual level to be a real help to others; still he is "under the law." Nothing in his early experience produced in him the emotional matrix which is necessary for an individual to grasp the principle of grace and to rest in it. Unless a person is loved freely and unconditionally in childhood so that he comes to think of his parents and the other significant adults in his life as warm, trustworthy, helpful and having his best welfare at heart, it becomes exceedingly difficult for him to grasp in any deep emotional sense that God, who seems so far away, can be loving and trustworthy. Small wonder that he cannot accept the pastor's loving ministrations at face value!

The pastor's problem reduces itself to how to thaw these persons out. This is done through surrounding these persons persistently with a "therapeutic atmosphere." A therapeutic atmosphere means one where the tone of his relationships is one of warmth, understanding, acceptance and permissiveness. Acceptance refers to an attitude which distinguishes the person from his annoying behavior. To be accepting is to see a person not in terms of his offenses but rather to see him as he may be when the love of Christ has filled his life. It is a recognition of the fact that he is more than these troublesome character traits. Permissiveness means that these persons are encouraged to tell how they really feel in a supportive atmosphere rather than being preoccupied with getting them to feel like they "should" feel. This latter is a worthy end, but if it precedes rather than follows a coming-to-grips with one's actual feelings, it only produces external compliance. This results in the biblically condemned "doublemindedness."

Creating and maintaining this therapeutic atmosphere falls mainly upon the pastor. He may have some real difficulties at this point, since it is likely that these victims of neurotic guilt will have tried very hard to put their pastor on the defensive by impugning his spiritual qualifications. Whenever the counselor becomes personally drawn into his counsellee's problems, he will have difficulty in maintaining his therapeutic attitude.⁹ For this reason it is necessary that the pastor make every effort to be aware of his own feelings about these people and that he deal with his negative reactions as they may arise.

If the pastor is able to keep from becoming defensive or otherwise emotionally involved, he is ready to tackle the real problem, which is helping these people to trust. Sometimes this takes a good bit of doing. No one likes to have his motives impugned. No one enjoys having his friendliness and concern spurned or made an object of suspicion. Yet the person has never known genuine love, and he does not want to be hurt. He may subject the pastor to expressions of hostility, bitterness, or skepticism toward the Christian faith in general and toward the Christian experience of pastor and people in particular. He will probe until he finds a sensitive area, and then prod in this area with considerable vigor. The pastor's response to this cynical or frightened reaction is crucial! If he can maintain an objective, loving concern through these tests to which his parishioner subjects him, he will eventually be delighted by some tentative efforts at a trusting response from the parishioner. If these are not pounced upon too eagerly, so that the person can assimilate them, the pastor will see his parishioner increasingly come to grips with his resentment and suspicion. He can face these because he now believes that the pastor will continue to love him in spite of his shortcomings, not because he has none. Since he can believe this about the pastor he can now also believe this about God with increasing wholeheartedness. As the rewarding impact of the warm friendships now made possible begin to take effect, the neurotic guilt reactions progressively decrease in intensity and frequency. The person's capacity to trust in the constancy of God's love and the warm affection of his fellow believers has given him the necessary courage to confront more and more areas of his life. Now he confesses rather than justifies himself in prayer, which sets in motion God's laws of spiritual growth. (I John 1:9).

Proper spiritual nurture of these persons demands the efforts of the entire congregation. All cannot respond to the intense interpersonal relationship described above. It is too frightening for them. If this is the case then a liberal prescription of what the medical profession has come to call TLC (tender, loving care) is in order. These people are easily emotionally bruised, and they may be as prickly as a porcupine to deal with. Nevertheless they must be drawn into the fellowship of the con-

⁹Seward Hiltner, *The Counselor in Counseling* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950).

gregation. The more emotionally mature and outgoing members of the congregation should be enlisted to see to it that these persons receive an affectionate welcome and encouragement to participate in the program of the church. Such people need to know they are valued, liked, sought after and that they are missed when they are absent. The pastor should try to drop in on these people often, although it is not necessary to make it a long visit. Brief calls at frequent intervals help these people more than a whole afternoon's call once a month.

It will probably be necessary to erect certain safeguards which will quietly but firmly prevent such a person from making the congregation over in his own image. If the pastor and his leaders understand the problem and can maintain both their warmth and their objectivity, these safeguards can be maintained with a minimum of friction.

These victims of neurotic guilt can create problems for a pastor and a congregation out of all proportion to their number. The easy way out is to fight fire with fire and attempt to get rid of them. In many ways, however, they present an exciting challenge to the maturity of our Christian faith. By maintaining a therapeutic attitude in the face of their bitterest and most disagreeable behavior, pastor and people come to depend more fully upon God's enabling grace. And as they see the love of Christ, as expressed through them, take hold of these people, thaw them out, and transform them, the congregation's faith in the power of God in Jesus Christ to make men what they ought to be becomes greatly strengthened.

¹⁰Carl Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1942), pp. 30-45. See also his *Client-Centered Therapy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951), chapters 2-4.

¹¹William G. Perry, Jr. and Stanley G. Estes, "The Collaboration of Client and Counselor," in O. H. Mowrer (ed.) *Psychotherapy* (New York: Ronald Press, 1953).

THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

LAMBERT J. PONSTEIN

The Synod of the Reformed Church has appointed a committee to study the ordination of women in the church. This of course means the ordination of women to all offices of the church. If such a study is to be of real value to the church, it ought not to be done solely by the members of the committee. There should be a thorough discussion of the problem by the church at large. Moreover, the discussion should be carried on during the life of the committee. It should be rooted in a firm desire to discover what the Word of God has to say to the church on this problem. This paper is presented in the hope that it may stimulate the church to think and to write. It is not the intention of this paper to come to a decision, but rather to place the problem before our minds. With that in mind, we approach our task.

The ordination of women has been instituted in some churches with very little discussion. This is especially true of some of the younger churches. Others have given very serious thought to the question, as for example De Hervormde Kerk in the Netherlands. Perhaps it may be well to mention some denominations who have given women the right of ordination. The Congregational Church has full ordination on a level with men. This is also true of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. The Salvation Army has always numbered women among its officers. The Church of God has a number of ordained women. More recently the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., has given women the right of ordination. In Great Britain the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church and the United Free Church of Scotland permit ordination of women to all offices. The Church of Christ in China has for years ordained women as elders. The Presbyterian Church of Korea ordains women to the office of deacon. The Church of Christ in Japan and the Church of Christ in the Philippines ordain women to the Christian ministry. These last two denominations ought to be of interest to us. Since we are closely connected with the work of these churches, one might say that we are already doing on the foreign field that which we are studying at home. This list is not complete, and as you have perhaps noted, does not in all cases apply to all the offices of the church. But the list ought to guard us from any hasty generalizations. Certainly one of these is that to grant ordination to women is following in the path of a very liberal attitude toward the authority of the Word.

When we turn to church history, we get little help. The position of women was such as to exclude them from office on an equality with men. The cultural situation was such that it was almost impossible for the problem to present itself. It is true that in the fourth century the office

of deaconess was in vogue. But the duty of these women was to prepare children and women for baptism. Instruction of men by women would have been considered an impossibility.¹ This order passed out of existence somewhere between the tenth and twelfth centuries.

The history of the period of the Reformation shows little change in the attitude toward women. Here again the background of the Reformers certainly influenced their attitudes. Their lives were rooted in the exclusive clerical and monastic experience of the mediaeval theologians. To this one must add the abuse of mariology, and the cultural pattern of the day.

In more modern church history there has been a greater interest in the place of women in the church. The list of churches which have given the right of ordination to women is certainly indicative of this renewed interest.

It may be of interest to note that in churches where women have been given the privilege of ordination to the Christian ministry, few women have accepted this privilege.²

In pursuing this problem, we ought not to disregard what other churches have done. We can learn from others. Perhaps we ought to keep a few statements in mind.

1. The fact that other churches have ordained women does not sanction our doing so.
2. A seeming lack of precedent in church history should not keep us from doing so.
3. The fact that few women have taken up the Christian ministry should not influence our judgment.
4. We shall have to be careful not to allow any notions we now have to influence our exegesis of the Word. We must pray that the Holy Spirit may guide us in our study.

The two passages most often cited as being opposed to the ordination of women are I Cor. 14:34-35, and I Tim. 2:11-12. Let us examine both of these passages, turning first to I Cor. 14:34-35. "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." The immediate reaction to this passage has often been to interpret it as a ban on the ordination of women on the ground that here they are prohibited from speaking in the church. Is this correct? One other passage in the same book will either help us or make the problem more difficult. This is I Cor. 11:3ff. Both passages refer to prophesying in the church. In I Cor. 11:5 the apostle definitely speaks of women who prayed and prophesied in the church. If

¹"Excursus on The Deaconess of the Early Church," *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. (New York: Scribners, 1900) Vol. XIV, p. 41.

²F. D. Bacon, *Women in The Church*, (London: Lutterworth Press, 1946) pp. 134ff.

this is correct, then the passage in I Cor. 14:34-35 which also refers to prophesying would seem to be in contradiction to it. That the commentators realized this dilemma is very obvious. Calvin seeks to harmonize these two passages by saying, "For when he reproves them for prophesying with their head uncovered, he at the same time does not give them permission to prophesy in some other way, but rather delays his condemnation of that vice to another passage, namely in chapter fourteen."³ Meyer in his commentary admits that Paul is speaking of women who did pray and prophesy. In order to harmonize this with chapter 14, he seeks to interpret this as a freedom allowed in smaller meetings, more limited circles assembled for worship, somewhat similar to "a church in the house."⁴ One may well ask whether in both cases this is not a forced interpretation of the text. I am quite sure that if Paul had not written I Cor. 14:34-35, neither of these men would have found a problem in a passage which seems rather simple to understand. Forgetting for the moment our notion about the place of women, it seems rather plain that Paul does allow women to pray and prophesy in the public assembly, but they are to have their heads covered. And why should women not prophesy in the church? The prophecy of Joel which is quoted in Acts 2:17 certainly pointed toward this. Acts 21:9 tells us of the four daughters of Philip who prophesied. The gift of prophesying was given to women as well as to men, and they made use of this gift in the public gathering of the church. Since this is so plain, perhaps the harmonizing ought to be done at I Cor. 14:34-35.

If we are going to understand Paul at all, we must first divest ourselves of thinking of the church service in terms of our own day. A public gathering, with the minister preaching a sermon and the people quietly listening, is certainly not the picture of a church service of the first century. Certainly it is not the picture of the Corinthian church. The type of service referred to in verses 34 and 35 is clearly explained in verses 26 through 33. The meeting was rather informal. Note verse 26. "How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation." Paul was certainly not opposed to this informality, but insisted that all things should be done decently and in order. Note verse 31. "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted."

We may ask ourselves as to whether or not this type of meeting, in which there seems to have been a great deal of discussion, was unusual. Seemingly not. In Acts 17:2 we read concerning Paul that "three sabbath days he reasoned with them out of the scriptures." The word used here is a form of *dialegesthai*, which indicates a discussion or dispute. In such a service there was undoubtedly the asking of questions. The same word is used in Acts 17:17, 18:19, 20:7, and others. In Acts 20:7, where we have

³John Calvin, *Corinthians*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948) Vol. I, p. 356.

⁴Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, *Commentary on The New Testament, Corinthians*. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1881) Vol. I. p. 320.

the incident at Troas, it is hardly reasonable that Paul preached six or eight hours. If this was a discussion, the time element makes sense. After all, the New Testament service came out of the synagogue, which was not the formalized service of our day.

We must look at I Cor. 14 from the point of view of the type of service that was being held. It was informal with many taking part. Paul has been discussing the speaking in tongues and the prophesying. Beginning at verse 29, he turns to the prophets. Two or three may prophesy. But then the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. Obviously women took part in the prophetic utterances. This would be in harmony with I Cor. 11. But in the questioning of the prophets, that is, in a discussion of what has been said, a new problem arises. If we join the last phrase of verse 33 to verse 34 (which is most likely correct) then Paul is pointing out that the practice in the Jewish Christian church is for women not to take part in this part of the service.⁵ They are to remain silent.

Why are they to remain silent? First we must take note of the fact that he is speaking to married women. He makes no mention of the single women. He bases his argument on the law, though he doesn't cite any particular passage. The Old Testament does have something to say about this in Numbers 5 and Numbers 30. It may be of interest to note that in Numbers 30:9 where women are enjoined to be subject to their husbands, the freedom of widows and divorcees is definitely granted. Paul from his Old Testament background has some definite ideas of the relationship of the husband and wife. The husband is definitely the head of the family, and the wife is in a relationship of *hypandros* (under the man). Romans 7 gives us an excellent idea of Paul's thinking on this subject. This relationship of the headship of the husband is to be maintained in the Christian service. The cultural pattern was such that for these married women to take part in the discussion in the presence of their husbands would have been a disgrace. It would have been out of place. A very pertinent question is whether single women and divorced women had a right to take part in the question period. Paul is interested in having all things done decently and in order—I Cor. 14:40.

Do we have here a rule against women ministers? These women did prophesy. Or do we have here rules for proper decorum in the Christian church, especially in view of the Jewish and Greek attitude toward women? If we have here simply Paul's attitude toward the place of women in a free discussion, and in more particular married women, then there is no difficulty in harmonizing the passage in I Cor. 11 and Paul's statement in I Cor. 14:34-35.

Let us now turn to I Timothy 2:11-12. "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp au-

⁵Gregory Dix, *Jew and Greek* (London: Dacre Press, 1953) pp. 19ff. Jean-Louis Leuba, *New Testament Pattern* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953) pp. 122ff. Both these works have a discussion of the term "churches of the saints."

thority over the man, but to be in silence." We ought to take note at once to the speaking to which Paul refers. It is again a speaking in order to learn, just as we have in I Cor. 14:34-35.⁶ It is very obvious when we place this passage against the background of what a New Testament service was like, that we again are faced with the problem of women maintaining their proper decorum. If this were simply prophesying, it would be for the edification of the church and not for learning on the part of the speaker. If, on the other hand, this were a learning simply by listening, then the words of Paul in verse 12 would make no sense. From what we know of the New Testament service, the teaching and learning involve a discussion in which there is the asking of questions.

In I Cor. 14 we have a discussion with those who prophesy. Here we have a discussion with those who teach. Seemingly there were many teachers in the New Testament church. This is very logical, since having heard the preaching of the gospel, the believers are now ready to be taught. Timothy is told: "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Timothy is to warn the church at Ephesus that those who are teaching must teach no other doctrine. Hebrews 5:12 indicates that the members of the church ought to be teachers. Romans 15:14 expects that the members of the church will admonish, that is, teach one another. Ephesians 4:11 indicates that there were a number of teachers in every church.

As we noted above, the problem involved in this text is the proper decorum of women in the church. We may be sure that again the married women are in the mind of the apostle. In the ancient world women married young, and the possibility of a number of mature unmarried women was out of the question.

We have Paul's attitude toward women from a Jewish point of view. Much the same was the attitude of the Greeks. The ancient Greek culture expected that a woman should keep silence in the presence of her husband, lest she show disrespect for him. "Silence," says Sophocles, "is woman's glory." Socrates put the question, "Is there anybody to whom you entrust more serious matters than to your wife—or to whom you talk less?" The attitude of Jew and Greek toward married women in the presence of their husbands was very similar.

Paul says that the woman is to learn in silence and to be in silence. The word which he uses for silence is *esuchia*. This word is used in I Thess. 4:11 and II Thess. 3:12 concerning the busybodies whom Paul commands to do their work in quietness. In these passages the meaning is that these people are to work within the proper rules of their society. Our interpretation of I Tim. 2:11-12 would therefore be that the women are

⁶George H. Gilbert, "Women in Public Worship in The Churches of Paul," *Biblical World*, Vols. I-II, 1893.

to learn within the proper rules of decorum, that is, with a proper respect toward their husbands. In I Cor. 14:34-35 the word used for silence has the meaning of silence as opposed to speaking. The passages may well complement one another. Proper decorum in the presence of the husband may be shown by not taking part in the questioning. This may be the Timothy passage. Being silent (as opposed to speaking) while the prophets are questioned is proper decorum. This may be the Corinthian passage.

The word which Paul uses for authority is *authentein*. The meaning of the word is to act on one's own authority. When we place this word alongside *andros* (man), and think for a moment about the meaning of *esuchia*, then we immediately get the full force of Paul's words. He doesn't want these women to take part in the discussion while their husbands are present. He feels that by doing so, they will not be in their proper realm. In our own day, in spite of the emancipation of women, we don't look too kindly on a woman who constantly has the floor while her husband is present. One need only to read Titus 2:3-5 to come to the conclusion that the advice was rather badly needed.

Perhaps it may be well to make some statements about our study of these passages.

1. Paul does allow women to pray and prophesy in a public service, but with proper decorum.
2. Married women are not to take part in the discussion of prophecy in the presence of their husbands.
3. In the process of teaching and learning, they are to show proper respect. The very nature of the situation indicates that married women are in the apostle's thinking.
4. Paul does believe that women have a position in the marriage bond which requires certain proprieties.
5. There is no discussion in these passages of church offices.

It would be well to turn to I Timothy 3 where we have a list of the qualifications for the office of *episkopos*, (elder) and deacon. All the qualifications for the office of elder indicate that the apostle has in mind only men. He is to be the husband of one wife and he must rule well his own house. Verses 8-10 deal with the qualifications of deacons. Verse 11 in the King James Version reads "Even so must their wives be grave, no slanderers, sober, faithful in all things." The possessive (their) which gives the idea of a reference to wives is not in the original. We have the same introductory word in verse 8 and verse 11—*hosautos* (even so). Verses 12 and 13 go back to the office of deacon and list qualifications which would have reference to men. We are now faced with the problem whether verse 11 refers to the qualifications for women deacons. If we say that this verse refers to the wives of the deacons, then why is nothing said of the wives of the elders. The early church fathers, includ-

ing St. John Chrysotom, Theodoret, and Theodore of Mopsuestia believed that verse 11 referred to women deacons.⁷

Earlier in this paper we mentioned the office of deaconess which existed in the early church. We find this office in I Tim. 5:9-10. This seems to have been a specific order of widows sixty years and over. This office which was dormant for some time is again coming into its own. If this is a New Testament office, and if we are insistent on the New Testament pattern, are we doing what we ought in this respect?

The New Testament speaks highly of women who labored in the early church. We have Priscilla, a helper in Christ Jesus; Mary, who bestowed much labor; Tryphena and Tryphosa, who also labored in the Lord; Persis, who labored much in the Lord; the beloved Apphia, Euodias, and Syntyche, who labored with Paul in the gospel. The same words of praise that were spoken of the men were used for the women. We don't have any instances of women elders or deacons, with the exception of Phoebe in Romans 16:1. In this case there may be some discussion as to the translation. But on the other hand, we don't have much information on the male elders and deacons in the church. If the seven in Acts 6 are deacons, these constitute the bulk of our information.

We have noted before that women did prophesy in the church. We must restudy I Timothy 3:11. Do we have here a basis for women deacons? Should we follow I Timothy 5:9 and establish everywhere the office of deaconess?

May women be elders in the church? At this point the authority of the elders to rule the church has always been a bone of contention. Let us grant the matter of authority. We are now faced with the question of what we mean by having authority. We must be careful not to view the elders as a modern board of directors, or an executive committee. The church is under the Lordship of Jesus Christ, and the elders must act in faith under this same Lordship. We realize that within the marriage bond the wife stands in a relationship of *hypandros*. Would this make it impossible for her to rule in faith under the Lordship of Christ?

The question of whether women ought to be admitted to the offices of the church is not as simple as an exclusion on the basis of I Cor. 14:34-35 and I Tim. 2:11-12. Neither is the other side of the question an easy one. Certainly we ought not to overlook the tremendous use of women in the New Testament Church. This is even more meaningful in view of the position of women in that early culture. There have been other times when the church has had to make decisions that were difficult. Let us as a church study together and discuss together what the Word of God has to say to us! And let us pray the Lord of the Church to guide us through his Spirit!⁸

⁷F. D. Bacon, *Women in The Church* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1946) pp. 45ff.

⁸N. J. Hommes, *De Vrouw In De Kerk* (Franeker: T. Wever, 1951). The writer has made wide use of this study. It is the most complete work available on the subject.

PHILIPPUS JACOBUS HOEDEMAKER

1839-1910

JAMES C. EELMAN

The name Hoedemaker is well known in contemporary Dutch theology. He deserves to become better known in our own theological circles. The views of this once lonely figure in the heated strife of the *Doleantie* have now become of profound interest and importance to the life of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. Although his theological ideas are primarily important in the life of the Dutch church, our own relationship to that church and its history demands some knowledge of this influential thinker. This brief introductory article is written in the hope that it may stimulate an interest in a Dutch theologian who, unlike Kuypers and Bavinck, is practically unknown in this country.

Hoedemaker was a contemporary and personal friend of the well-known Dutch theologian and statesman, Abraham Kuypers. This friendship, however, did not prevent him from becoming the most critical opponent of Kuypers's views on secession and the relationship between church and state. In a world which demands action, the more resolute and less scrupulous Kuypers succeeded while the hesitant but critical Hoedemaker was never fully understood or appreciated until after his death. The heated tempers of secession could not evaluate the importance of the principles by which Hoedemaker remained in the national church. These principles, however, never died but gradually took root until they came to fruition in the recent reorganization of the *Hervormde Kerk* under a new church order.

Of particular interest to us in America is the fact that Hoedemaker received much of his early education in this country.¹ Although it is impossible to trace every influence that affected the life and ministry of this servant of God, it is sufficient to note in passing that his early ministry in the Netherlands was characterized by the American Sunday school and evangelistic type of activity. He also had a passion for the social welfare of the working classes. So full of plans and activity was this vigorous pastor that one elder in his first congregation considered the name "Hoedemaker" to be a misnomer. "Planmaker" would have been much more appropriate.

Philippus Jacobus Hoedemaker was born in Utrecht of the Netherlands on July 16, 1839, the son of Johannes Hoedemaker and his wife Evertje Beukers. His father operated a religious book store which for those days was quite a difficult undertaking. Thanks to the general religious revival and the many theological controversies, the business flourished. The store

¹The biographical sketch is based on the excellent work by Dr. G. P. H. Scheers, *Philippus Jacobus Hoedemaker* (Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1936).

also became a kind of forum where the various religious differences were debated.

Father Hoedemaker belonged to the secession party which in 1838 had left the national Reformed Church in protest against the results of the reorganization of that church in 1816. Under this plan of reorganization, which was largely fostered by the crown and the liberal forces within the church, an administrative synod known as *Het Algemeen Reglement voor het bestuur der Hervormde Kerk*² was permanently appointed. This simply transformed the once independent confessional church into a dependent state church. The seceders condemned the old church as a false church and chose the road of least resistance. They simply "pulled out." Father Hoedemaker had joined these seceders under the persuasive influence of none other than our own H. P. Scholte, the founder of the Dutch settlement in Pella, Iowa.

Mother Hoedemaker was the daughter of Philippus Jacobus Beukers, a school teacher at Munschoten. She was a deeply religious woman with a strain of mystical piety so characteristic of many Dutch Calvinists. It was largely through her devout influence that the home became a spiritual center. She could not agree with her husband on the secession question. Only after a strong protest and for the sake of family peace, she finally consented to the baptism of young Philippus in the secession church at Utrecht, but all her life she remained loyal to the national Reformed Church. She passionately desired the restoration and renewal of that church, but she never deserted it in the hour of its calamity and spiritual decline. Before Philippus was born she had a profound religious experience in which she was assured that her expected child would not only become a preacher of the gospel, but would also become a blessing for the national church to which she was so devoted. This piety and loyalty to the church of her fathers had a deep and permanent influence upon young Hoedemaker.

In the year 1851 the family emigrated to America. Religious motives seemed to have been primary. "I can no longer live under the present conditions of our church," said Mother Hoedemaker. Since her son Philippus was dedicated to the ministry of the gospel, his spiritual training would be of the utmost importance. The family expressed more faith in the American theological professors at the New Brunswick Seminary than in the teachers who occupied the chairs of theology in the fatherland. As they sailed away from the old world, everything seemed to point in the direction that Philippus Hoedemaker was destined for the ministry in the Reformed Church in America. As we shall see later, God's providence ordained otherwise.

The family had chosen the Michigan colony in Holland as their destination, but upon arrival in this country, they decided to settle in Kalamazoo. Sadly enough, shortly after their arrival in Kalamazoo,

Mother Hoedemaker died. "With her death," said young Philippus, "I lost that guiding hand which I so sorely needed at this time of my life." The loss of his mother's spiritual power and influence no doubt contributed to his early years of indecisiveness and instability. He was, however, determined to further his education as much as possible. Not long after his mother's death he entered Kalamazoo College where he was considered an outstanding student. Here he made the personal acquaintance of Ralph Waldo Emerson. This great American scholar evidently saw something unusual in the hard working Dutch lad, for he encouraged him to continue his studies with special reference to the classics.

Upon completion of his work in Kalamazoo he entered Rutgers College at New Brunswick, New Jersey. At that time the college and the theological seminary were closely related. A chair in the seminary required that the professor also teach certain subjects in the college. The teaching in the school was strictly in the conservative tradition of the old Dutch Reformed Church. Like most young men in their formative years, Philippus had many doubts and questions about the validity and usefulness of the old conservative Dutch theology. After two years he could stand it no longer and left to take a position in a lawyer's office in the city of New Brunswick. He became interested in politics and took an active part in the presidential election of 1856. Ironically enough, the man who in later life never expressed any sympathy for the democratic spirit had joined the Democrats. In the event that the party became victorious, he had been promised a position as secretary to the American legation in the Hague, but when the Democrats did win the election, Hoedemaker turned down the position and left politics. He returned to Kalamazoo and worked for a while as a clerk in a hardware store, but the consistory of the church, impressed with his intellectual ability, appointed him as a teacher in their newly organized school. It was the first step to lead him back upon the road to the sacred ministry. That calling which he had once forsaken with disgust now began to draw him again. He finally resigned from the teaching job and entered the Congregational Theological Seminary in Chicago. According to Hoedemaker the spiritual tone of the seminary was more or less "methodistic." More attention was given to training in practical work than in theological discipline. This influence no doubt accounted for his emphasis upon evangelization and Sunday school work during his early ministry in the Netherlands.

Upon the completion of a three year course, he spent the better part of a year as a supply minister in the Olivet Congregational Church of Chicago. Of his work here we have this comment, "I was never happy in this ministry, for I suffered from a spiritual poverty which made my work a burden." Restlessness and a nostalgia for the old world further impaired the usefulness of his ministry in Chicago. He greatly desired to see England, Germany and Palestine. Later he interpreted this restless wanderlust

as comparable to that of the prophet Jonah, namely, "fear of myself and fear of the ministry." Thus in 1862 he severed his ties with the Olivet church and sailed for England. On his way to Germany he stopped in the Netherlands to visit many old friends and relatives. Here he was received with open arms and in hope that he would remain to lend his influence to the difficult problems which faced the Dutch church. In Amsterdam the young preacher was invited to conduct the morning service in the Oosterkerk, a regular Reformed congregation, but in the evening he had also scheduled a service in one of the secession churches. On the eve of these appointments he suddenly received word that his service in the secession church had been cancelled because he had also consented to preach in the *Hervormde Kerk*. It was his first unpleasant contact with the difficult church problem which involved him so strenuously the remainder of his life.

Although it had not been his intention to remain in the Netherlands, it seemed that the voice of God spoke through the many friends who finally persuaded him to stay and become a minister of the gospel in the mother country. For this service his American theological training was considered inadequate and unacceptable. He would have to take the full study requirements in one of the Dutch theological schools. When Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee was appointed to the chair of theology in the University of Utrecht, his friends persuaded him to enter this school as a student for the ministry in the Dutch church. Here he made an excellent scholastic record, and on June 21, 1867 he was graduated *magna cum laude*.²

On the 16th of February, 1868 he was installed as pastor in the town of Veenendaal. After five years he accepted a call to Rotterdam where he served until 1880 when he was appointed professor at the Free University of Amsterdam. His disagreement with Kuyper and the *Doleerende* led him to resign from the Free University. He served briefly in Nijland (1888-1890) after which he accepted a call to Amsterdam where he remained until retirement in 1909. He died on July 26, 1910 in the home of his daughter.

Though he was a faithful pastor in his congregations, he never confined his work to the local church which he served. The spiritual sickness of the national church also demanded his attention, and he soon discovered that the ills of the national body also affected the welfare of each local congregation. It was within this pastoral situation that Hoedemaker developed his ecclesiastical and political thought. In order to appreciate this

²The General Rules for the Administration of the Reformed Church.

³It may be of interest to note that in 1871 Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee was invited to fill the chair of dogmatic theology. In the event that he would be unable to accept the position, the seminary asked him to make his own recommendations. Van Oosterzee recommended both Philippus Hoedemaker and Abraham Kuyper with a note that he would not like to see Hoedemaker leave the Netherlands.

development, it is necessary to give a brief summary of the historical situation in both state and church during the nineteenth century.

THE STRUGGLE OF THE DUTCH CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY⁴

After the defeat of Napoleon, William I of the house of Orange returned to the Dutch throne. He found the national church in the most desperate condition. The spirit of the Enlightenment had deeply penetrated and profoundly weakened the spiritual strength of the church. The effect of the French occupation and the philosophical views of the political revolution had only served to aggravate the sickness of the church. Having lost her favored position as the recognized church of the nation, she seemed incapable of governing herself without state support. When, therefore, the French were defeated and Dutch rule was once more established, the church looked to the crown for help. In fact, already under French rule a plan had been drawn up to assist the helpless church. That plan which the French never executed was the very plan King William I put into operation. Although the King called together an advisory commission of eleven ministers, very little if any changes were made in the original plan. On Sunday, January 7, 1816 the King signed into law regulations governing the administrative affairs of the national church. The members of all the classes and provincial synods were commanded to cease their functions. The church had become a vassal of the government. Once in the formative years of her history, the church had exercised a great and good influence over the state. Now she was completely dependent upon the state.

Under the new administrative regulations the structure of church government became bureaucratic and lost its presbyterian character. The higher assemblies no longer originated in the lower assemblies but were appointed by the government. Only at the local level of each congregation was self-government allowed to function through the consistory; but since the consistory was no longer related to any other judicatory through a proper system of representation, it simply degenerated into a sub-administrative group. The foundation was laid for a struggle which engaged the Dutch church for over a hundred years.

The first radical reaction to the deplorable church situation was the secession of 1838 under the leadership of H. De Cock and H. P. Scholte. They and their followers traveled the road of least resistance and got out, but they did not solve the problems of the sick national church. Within her bosom the struggle for renewal and restoration continued unabated. One of the most prominent men of this time was the gifted layman, Mr. G. Groen van Prinsterer (1801-1876). He advocated a restoration of effective doctrinal discipline and uncompromising loyalty to the confessional standards of the church. He believed that eventually this would rid

⁴The historical section is largely dependent upon a church history by Dr. H. Berkhof, *Geschiedenis der Kerk* (Nijkerk: G. F. Callenbach N.V., 1950).

the church of all undesirable opposition and lead her back to the desired restoration. He was also a firm believer in the Calvinistic principle of a theocracy in which church and state would work closely together. When, however, he saw the liberal state becoming more absolute and less religious, he reluctantly changed his views and demanded the complete separation of church and state. He exchanged the Calvinistic ideal of a divine rule over both church and state for that of a free church within a neutral state. This new view formed the theological watershed between the old classical Calvinism and the neo-Calvinism so successfully promulgated by Abraham Kuyper.

What van Prinsterer had done out of historical necessity, Kuyper did out of principle. With all his appeal to John Calvin and Calvinism, Kuyper lacked one of the essential marks of the Reformed mood as expressed in its theocratic ideals. He rejected the idea of a national church altogether and contended that the church, if she is to be a genuine church, should consist only of true confessing Christians. On the other hand he fully accepted the revolutionary principle that in matters of religion the state should be completely neutral. The Calvinistic segment of the nation must separate itself so that among themselves they might build up a Christian culture through Christian schools and organizations in order that through these every sphere of life might be penetrated. No doubt influenced by the theory of evolution, Kuyper believed in the free competition and development (*ontwikkeling*) of all the spiritual forces within the nation. He firmly believed that the inherent spiritual power within Calvinism would ultimately triumph over all other contending forces. With his tremendous intellectual energy and journalistic ability he was able to penetrate the national life of the Dutch people. It was therefore largely through his dynamic leadership that the *Hervormde Kerk* experienced another secession in 1886. The seceding churches called themselves the *Dolerende Kerken*, because they sorrowed over the loss of their property. In 1892 the *Dolerende Kerken* joined those of the earlier secession to form the denomination known as the *Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland*.

HOEDEMAKER'S DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

Hoedemaker belongs to that group of thinkers who develop their ideas in conflict with others. Slowly he began to see the significance of the difficult church problems. His first active protest came in 1868 when the national Synod refused to accede to a request to make the trinitarian baptismal formula compulsory. Significantly he saw that this refusal would end the last basis of fellowship with the modernists, for baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit still bound all segments of the church into a common body.

In the theological journal, *De Heraut* of 1880 there is an excellent summary of his objections to the synodical organization of 1816.

The organization denies the presbyterian character of the church, limits the rights of the overseers, limits the jurisdiction of the consistories, mocks the representation of the church in the classes, renounces the principle that Christ is the head of the church, that his word is the only rule in the church, exercises an hierarchial authority, invalidates the confessions, and therefore oppresses the life of the entire church.

The synod's refusal to enforce doctrinal discipline and its general tolerance of every viewpoint also gave opportunity for various groups to organize themselves into parties which sought to control the church. Hoedemaker roundly condemned this party spirit as sectarian. Party spirit leads to strife and division. Within the body of Christ we are members one of another with a common interest, but the purpose of a party within the church is to defeat opposing groups. It was at this point that Hoedemaker took his departure from Abraham Kuyper and his followers. Once he had found in Kuyper a most congenial spirit of cooperation and fellowship. "I had the privilege to know Dr. Kuyper from the time when he first took action against the synod in Utrecht. I fully enjoyed his company and was bound to him in a genuine bond of friendship."⁵ He had some reservations about Kuyper's program, but he fully trusted his friend and the correctness of the Reformed principles that governed his activities. Even in the early days of the *Doleantie* he took his position with the ministers who had been suspended. However, he did demand that the benefits of any re-reformation within the church should come to all who are embraced in God's covenant of grace. When a *Gereformeerd Congres* was called together on January 11, 1887, Hoedemaker's eyes were opened. Consequently he turned down the invitation to participate in this gathering. Kuyper openly condemned Hoedemaker as unstable and timid. Hoedemaker replied that he was neither vacillating or timid but that his eyes had been opened. "The Congress intends the organization of those who are spiritually congenial to each other. This is the very nature of sectarianism. My purpose is the salvation of the Church."⁶ He saw that the goal of Kuyper's strategy was no longer a confessing church governed by the word of God with brotherly discipline but a church of *onder onsjes* (among ourselves), bent upon cutting off all who deviated from Reformed principles. Hoedemaker wanted a reformation for the whole church. If the church were ever to experience such a reformation, all of its sickly members must become the beneficiaries. In those days of decision and heart-searching he wrote to his friend Kuyper, "In a few days I will either be completely on your side or completely separated from you." In another undated letter he said, "I am a friend of Kuyper but a greater friend of the church."⁷

The real reason why Hoedemaker could not join the Kuyperian seceders was fundamentally a question of loyalty to God's word. To him

⁵Quoted by Scheers, *op cit.*, p. 35.

⁶*De Congresbeweging*, p. 51.

⁷Quoted from an undated letter by Scheers, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

the *Doleantie* was not a genuine attempt to institute church government according to the Scriptures. Though the separatists considered the synodical organization unbiblical, he felt that the *Gereformeerde* party had not made a single attempt to give the church a truly biblical constitution. No one raised the question, "What saith the Scriptures?" The main concern of the *doleerende* seemed to be how to get rid of the modernists. Since no radical reformation was sought, the *Doleantie* was incapable of producing one. On the contrary it further broke the unity of the church and abandoned it to the organization from which the *doleerende* had pledged to deliver her.

In all of his writings the theme of a church organization based solely upon the Scriptures occurs again and again. Before any effective work of reorganization can be undertaken, there should be diligent Bible study so that the goal of all reform is always the production of a truly Scriptural church order. "The very same Scriptures which teach us that there is a church, also define her nature and the relationship which Christ has to her. The Holy Scriptures teach us what the church is, what her offices are, and how she must be organized."⁸ What then does he think the Scriptures teach about the church and its organization? In his book, *De Kerk en het Moderne Staatsrecht (The Church and Modern Civil Law)*, Hoedemaker sets forth his doctrine of the church along both negative and positive arguments. He first of all denies that the church is a mere union of individuals. "She is not rooted in any activity of the human will, for only God himself has set the bounds of the visible church through the covenant which he made with Abraham and his seed."⁹ The church is neither a society based upon the common agreement and consent of its members in which no other law is valid than the will of a majority, nor is it synonymous with the visible institution. "The relation between Christ as the head, and the church as his body, is an organic one. In nature the church is invisible, but in every empirical manifestation of her faith she becomes visible."¹⁰

Hoedemaker admits that the Bible gives no clear direction as to how the church ought to be governed, but he concludes that Christ himself is the model after which the church patterns her organized life. Christ organizes and rules his church through the ministry which he has appointed, but he has never abdicated his authority either to the ministry or to the institution. The authority of the ministry is one of service rather than of rule.¹¹

At no point is he clearer than on his views of the relationship of the local churches to each other. The *Doleerende* insisted upon the complete autonomy of each congregation. Any relationship between them depends upon common consent and agreement. Therefore you could not speak of

⁸*De Kerk en het moderne staatsrecht*, p. 92.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 93.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 116.

¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 137-176.

a Reformed church but only of Reformed churches. Hoedemaker on the other hand insisted that the local church manifests itself in a particular locality as the total body of Christ. Local congregations do not stand in a mere confederate relationship to each other but their relationship is organic and indissoluble. The separate congregations also form a collective unity which finds its expression in a common confession and government. This collective unity cannot be reduced to the common consent of those who constitute it, for it is the gift of God. Local churches are related to each other as members are in an organic body or in a common household. "He who is a member of one congregation is a member of all, and he who becomes the pastor of a local congregation is so recognized by all the other churches."¹² The different congregations of the *Hervormde Kerk* in the Netherlands constitute one union, one fellowship, and one corporate body. They have not been joined to each other by common consent or agreement upon a common confession.

He also felt that the seceders had lost sight of the important view that a Reformed confession can only function in a Reformed church order. It cannot be treated by a group of "faithful members" as something quite independent in origin and existence of the whole church. He accused the seceders of wresting the confession out of the body of the church, because they used it as a basis for a confederation of common accord. The confession functions like a heart in an organism. "A heart belongs in the body wherein it was born, and there it became what it is. Tear out that heart and all you have left is the corpse."¹³

It was evident that the seceders only recognized the church in a particular doctrinal point of view. This was not Calvin's teaching on the matter. He held that though one congregation may conceive the reformation more radically than another, every Reformed congregation, in spite of its imperfection, considered the reformation to be a visible manifestation of the one church brought back to the word of God.¹⁴

Kuyper's concept of the church centers in the born-again persons who are manifest before the world by their consent to the Reformed confessions, while Hoedemaker acknowledged the church wherever God sealed his covenant in the sacrament of baptism. Consequently Hoedemaker could not desert the baptized multitude, for in that sacrament he recognized the claims of Christ upon the nation. His slogan became, "the whole church and the whole nation." The entire church, and through her the entire nation, must be brought under the lordship of Jesus Christ.

CHURCH AND STATE

The goal of Hoedemaker's church policies was a restored church which would once again lead the entire life of the Dutch nation. The theocratic

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 164.

¹³*Ibid.*, pp. 210, 211.

¹⁴*Vragen van de dag*, p. 136.

vision which had once influenced Mr. Groen van Prinsterer illuminated Hoedemaker's thought and governed his actions. The close relation between the church problem and that of the nation became increasingly clearer. The Reformed principle of God's sovereignty must also determine the church's relation to the state. Upon his farewell to the Free University, he said to one of the professors, "The difference between us lies much deeper than in the ecclesiastical and theological spheres. My intention is to bring back our nation to a profession of the Reformed faith. . . I do not believe in a neutral state."¹⁵ This was Kuyper's great mistake, for he accepted the French revolutionary principle of a neutral state without reservations. The revolution introduced a new concept of civil law which no longer recognized the church as the body of Christ. The law recognized religious bodies in which the spiritual life of all humanity comes to expression. Kuyper accepted this new legal situation with all of its drastic theological consequences. He agreed with the revolution that everything which still reminds men of the old ties between church and state should be abolished. This Hoedemaker considered the root of all evil in the contemporary political and religious situation. Once a man accepts the principle of neutrality, he must also accept the fruits of unbelief, because it is unbelief that lies at the very basis of this revolutionary tenet. Furthermore, it allows the truth of God to come into competition with non-Christian philosophies, for the neutral state must allow all segments of the national life the opportunity to develop themselves. This is all Kuyper claimed for the gospel. "All that the gospel demands is an unlimited freedom to develop ourselves within the bosom of our national life."¹⁶

As professor A. A. Van Ruler points out, Hoedemaker is the only one in the Netherlands who ever described the results of this "neutral state" principle. The inevitable consequences are, 1. "The tyranny of the majority." 2. "The general instability of government." 3. "The destruction of the unity and character of the nation."¹⁷ In the well-known work, *Heel de Kerk en Heel het Volk*, Hoedemaker speaks of the unalterable opposition between "the majority" and "the truth." "Our life is now dominated by the idea that only the voice of the majority is valid. We no longer ask what is right or what is true, what God's will is or what the Scriptures require. The minority is simply crushed to death. If you wish to influence the national life with your Christian principles, you can only do your best to become the majority voice in the nation."¹⁸ Consequently, power politics whether desired or not also becomes a means whereby the Christian church attains its objectives in the nation. This is an attempt to escape the

¹⁵Eenebelijdenis?, pp. 26, 27.

¹⁶A. Kuyper, *Maranatha* (Amsterdam: 1891) p. 20.

¹⁷A. A. Van Ruler, *Religie en Politiek* (Nijkerk: G. F. Callenbach N.V., 1945), p. 244.

¹⁸*Heel de kerk en heel het volk*, p. 13.

burden of the cross (*lijdenschuweid*). In contrast the reformers of the sixteenth century did not merely contend for their rights as a minority; they demanded that the magistrate in obedience to God Almighty protect the true religion. They inevitably knew that their stand would result in persecution, because the authorities had already accepted the Roman interpretation as the true religion.

It seems clear that Hoedemaker desired that the state subject itself solely to the authority of the Word of God, while Kuyper, though he also wished that the men of the state subject themselves to God's Word within their conscience, nevertheless made the state much more subservient to the national spirit of the people as reflected in the composition of their chosen representatives.

Hoedemaker also saw that the different minority groups would out of necessity form coalitions with each other in order to attain their desired goals. The very idea of a coalition suggests compromise. Any cooperation with other parties within the national life could do great harm to the cause of truth, because in a coalition each party surrenders some of its principles and program in order to attain those things upon which previous agreement has been made. Therefore he lashed out vehemently against Kuyper's political coalition with the church of Rome. Kuyper had always defended this coalition on the basis that between the Reformed and the Roman church there still existed certain bonds of confessional unity. Hoedemaker did not deny this, but he strongly declared that in Rome's political activity these bonds of unity do not exist. He drew a most interesting distinction between the *church* of Rome and the *court* of Rome. Though Protestants may readily unite with Rome in common confession through the three great ecumenical creeds, they cannot join the court of Rome in a political coalition, for that court still aims at the establishment of her totalitarian authority over all the nations. It was precisely on account of this evil abuse of spiritual authority that the reformers limited the religious freedom of Roman Catholics and excluded them from taking part in the government of the nation.

Only God knows what loss we stand to suffer from those who willingly surrender the state in hope of gain for their own party. The strength of the reformation lies in the Word of God and not in cooperation with unbelief or with Rome. . . . Extend your hand to Rome because you say that she is anti-revolutionary. Rome is still honest enough to tell you that she will never rest until with your cooperation she destroys the last reminder of Protestantism in our national life. Rome will never be content until the Pope is once more acknowledged as supreme by both the civil authority and the people.¹⁹

Historical events have justified this statement, for it is remarkable indeed how this unheeded warning spelled disaster to the Protestant character of the once Calvinist nation. At first Rome formed a coalition with the Liberal party, and together they succeeded in their attempt which threw

¹⁹*Tegen Rome—Gods Woord*, p. 17.

the Bible out of the public school system. A Christian nation lost the Christian character within her educational system. From that time forward the nation's public school has been called "the neutral school." Flushed with success Rome joined with Kuyper and his Gereformeerde Anti-revolutionary party to dip into the public treasury for the establishment of Roman schools to propagate the Roman religion. The immediate benefits to Kuyper's party were overshadowed by the strength with which Rome returned to the Dutch national life in order to wipe out the last remnants of the Protestant characteristics so dear to that nation. No one foresaw this with clearer insight and sorrow than Dominee Hoedemaker. He could foresee a divided nation in which the majority would either be dechristianized or romanized. Though Kuyper hailed the coalition as a means to build Christian schools and permeate the state with Christian influence, Hoedemaker deplored the situation. "The great mistake of our Christian people lies in their belief that Christian education can save us while the Christian quality of our nation is watered down. It is foolish to think that a Christian people can survive in an unchristian society which is governed either by a neutral or a pagan state."²⁰

Hoedemaker also strenuously opposed Kuyper's mutilation of Article XXXVI in the Belgic Confession. Kuyper had always shown a dislike for the phrase in that article where the magistrate is charged "to remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship; that the kingdom of antichrist may be thus destroyed." All objections should be properly adjudicated through the courts of the church before they are publicly advocated. Kuyper was always ready to administer the medicine of discipline against the modernists for their public deviations from the confession, but he never seemed to consider the applicability of this medicine to his own confessional deviation. Furthermore, Hoedemaker could not accept the interpretation of this article which took the position that here the civil authorities are commanded to root out heresy. He felt that the objection was rooted in several dogmatic errors related to such important questions as the knowledge of God, of the church, the interpretation of Scripture, and the relationship of the Old and the New Covenant. To scrap the disputed phrase from the Confession is rather an acknowledgment that the authority of the Scriptures is not sufficiently recognized. "Abnormal reality" is a poor norm to determine the rules for faith and life. Everyone must be realistic, "but he who for the sake of present reality sacrifices the truth has chosen opportunism for his guide."²¹ The rejection of Scripture as the sole norm for all life and faith is rooted in another fundamental error, namely, that of the understandability of the Scriptures (*perspicuitas Sacrae Scripturae*). Kuyper contended that the civil authority must have his eyes opened spiritually before he can understand the Scriptures. This is a confusion of the natural sense and the spiritual sense of Scripture. The Bible

²⁰*Het eerstgeboorterecht*, p. 19.

²¹*Eene belijdenis*, p. 81.

is also a proper guide for our natural life. "The civil authority finds the revelation of God's holy will in the Scriptures."²² To withhold the Bible from the civil authority because it cannot understand that revelation, is rooted in the Roman error which withholds the Scriptures from the laity for the same reason.

Kuyper also denied the sufficiency of the Scriptures (*sufficiëntia Sacrae Scripturae*) as a guide for all of life. He felt that the Bible teaches little if anything about the relation of church and state. Hoedemaker quotes Kuyper as saying, "It can be safely said that there is not even as much as a hint in the Bible to show the friendly magistrate how he should conduct himself in behalf of the church."²³ The Scriptures may not give precise directions to the magistrate, but they do give basic principles to guide us in the world.

Hoedemaker also had serious objections to Kuyper's theological distinction between common and particular grace (*gemeene gratie en particuliere gratie*). According to this distinction the state is said to walk in the light of common grace while the church is the institution of particular grace. Common grace makes human life possible in spite of sin; its natural embodiment is in the civil state. Particular grace on the other hand is only for the saved and their life in the church of God. Hoedemaker saw no line of distinction between the two spheres of grace. He, however, did see the activity of particular grace in areas which Kuyper had solely reserved for common grace. "The divine deliverance is also a restoration. Christ has not merely delivered us from the punishment of sin to the end that we must still work out our own sanctification and deliverance. He has fulfilled all righteousness for us so that everything which the first man ruined is now fully restored."²⁴ Kuyper's divisions rob the church of her divine calling to minister the Word both to the nations and to their governments.²⁵

It seems that Kuyper accepts the church and the state as he finds them in the contemporary situation, and therefore tailors his theology of common grace and particular grace to meet the needs of the day. Hoedemaker, on the other hand, wants to see these institutions only in the light of God's holy Word. Kuyper was able to give a new form to the old Calvinism which was compatible with the contemporary social and political revolution. He recognized only one means of contact between the church and state, and that was through his Christian political party. In the background stood the Free University where the eternal principles of God's word are studied in order to bring these to bear upon the political life of

²²*Ibid.*, p. 95.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 112.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 111.

²⁵For a helpful discussion of this problem see A. A. Van Ruler, *op. cit.*, pp. 267-283.

the day. Hoedemaker rejected these means as contrary to the Word of God. He saw that Kuyper only gave form to that which already lived in the souls of the pious Calvinists. The Christian becomes more prominent than the Christ, and the sovereignty of God over the entire nation is reduced to the "*souvereiniteit in eigen kring*" (the sovereignty in each particular group). This destroys the prophetic vision of a holy nation governed according to the law of God and breaks the unity of the nation. Hoedemaker saw the whole neo-Calvinist revolution as a lack of faith in the eternal God who is able to break the neutrality of the state in order that his name may be known again in the cultural and public life of the nation. Kuyper accepted the revolutionary principle that the authority of the state basically resides in the individual while Hoedemaker maintained the biblical ideal that all authority is of God. The authority of the state is God-given. Consequently her chief task is to praise and honor the God of salvation, and to guide the entire life of the nation according to the justice of God as restored by the offering of Jesus Christ upon the cross.

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

In bringing this study to a close, permit me to say that I have only touched upon Hoedemaker's significance in the briefest possible manner. He was a man of many talents. I have only selected thoughts and passages which seemed most important to me. One could truthfully say that his entire ministry was characterized by a zeal for God's Word and a love for the *Hervormde Kerk* as the one national church of the Reformation in the Netherlands. In his understanding of the place of the confession within a scriptural church order he was without peer. His criticism of Kuyper's Christian coalition politics has been validated in the course of Dutch history. The nation has been both paganized and romanized. The political criticism of democracy which no one seemed to heed or understand in his day has received new interest and reflection. His insights into the fallacies of Kuyperian theology deserve a careful study in this country. We too have been influenced by Kuyper's sectarianism and separatism. It is in this area that we must think through the whole contemporary conflict of Christian schools versus the schools of the nation. This problem is more than one of having the right philosophy of Christian education. As Hoedemaker saw so clearly, it touches the whole difficult problem of the relation between church and state.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor A. A. Van Ruler of the University of Utrecht. His works introduced me to Hoedemaker. In Van Ruler's many excellent writings, Hoedemaker's voice is still heard in the church and nation which he loved so well.

The prophetic voice which cried in the wilderness of the confused Dutch church so many years ago is much more than an interesting man

of history; his influence is still felt in the life of both church and nation.²⁰ In a letter addressed to the directors of the Free University he said, "If I have God's word with me, I am ready to travel roads the end of which I am unable to see." This essentially was Hoedemaker.

²⁰The reorganization of *De Hervormde Kerk* in 1945 has certainly proven the fruitfulness and correctness of Hoedemaker's ideas. The writer of this article regrets that he was not able to include many more interesting discussions between Hoedemaker and other theologians of his day.

SHEOL: ITS CONCEPT AND SIGNIFICANCE

CHARLES P. JOHNSON

The aim and purpose of this paper, on the basis of its limited research, is to shed some light on the Old Testament concept of Sheol, and its significance.

One may ask the question, "Why choose a subject of such small import?" The importance of the subject becomes evident when one begins to search the Old Testament Scriptures on the subject, and learns that the idea of Sheol plays no small role in the thinking of the Hebrew on the question of life after death. By way of illustration it should be noted that the word Sheol occurs sixty-five times in the Old Testament, being translated in the King James "grave" thirty-one times, "hell" thirty-one times, and "pit" three times. The Revised Standard Version is more consistent in that it leaves the word untranslated.

We shall begin with an exegetical study of the pertinent sections of Isaiah 14:3-11. In regards to this passage G. G. D. Kilpatrick states, "This tremendous chapter, with its incomparable poetry and imaginative power, ranks among the great passages of all literature" (*Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 5, p. 258).

In the context God through the prophet Isaiah foretells the fall of Babylon and the subsequent triumph of Israel. We are here concerned primarily with the section about the fall of Babylon.

We shall dismiss vss. 3-8 with a brief statement of its content. Israel is addressed and told that she will bring a taunt against Babylon (vs. 4). The taunt is then recorded in section 4b through 21. The central thought of this taunt is that Babylon who was so mighty in worldly power is conquered and brought down by the Lord. A real piece of hyperbole is set forth in vss. 7-8 where even the earth is said to be at peace and rest, and the mighty cedars of Lebanon break forth into rejoicing for no longer do they feel the malicious conqueror's ax.

In contrast to the peacefulness of the earth (vss. 9-11), *Sheol* is spoken of as being stirred up in anticipation of the arrival of Babylon, "whose strength has been extinguished in death." In opening this section Kilpatrick has a very fine paragraph which I would like to quote: "There is a swift transition from the sunlit land to Sheol, the dusty prison house of the ghostly dead, where through the eternities they set immobile in vacuous contemplation. Suddenly there is a stir in that insubstantial company and spectral kings rise from spectral thrones to stare at the figure which glides among them. Enter another monarch stripped of earthly splendor, unannounced by trumpet call. Their greeting is a passionless whisper, 'You too, your glory gone, come to dust?' And once again silence settles on the halls of the dead" (*ibid*, p. 261).

Sheol according to Koehler (*Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*) seems to have two basic meanings: 1—"Harm," "hell"—probably referring to a place where the wicked go. 2—"Waste," "no-country," or "under-world," which undoubtedly refers to a place where all the dead go—grave (p. 935).

It is interesting to note that within three short verses the King James uses both "hell" and "grave" to translate this word *Sheol*. What the reason is for such change is difficult to ascertain. The question put before us then is, to what does Isaiah here refer by the term *Sheol*? Is it a grave or a place where the wicked go as a punishment? In order to answer the question we must consider the context in which the word is found. R. B. V. Scott in the *Interpreter's Bible* says that *Sheol* is not meant here to be translated "hell," but rather "grave," as it is referred to as the abode of the shades (*rephaim*). Simply stated the *rephaim* are the shades or ghosts of the departed. (A fuller discussion of *rephaim* follows in the next section).

Delitzsch in his *Commentary on Isaiah* (3rd edition) discusses *Sheol* in the LXX terminology of *hades*, but does not explain if this is a place of the wicked, or a grave as a receptacle for all men. His main point is on the *rephaim* which will be cited in the discussion of that term (Vol. I, p. 224). Gray (*International Critical Commentary, Isaiah*, Vol. I), holds somewhat the same position as does Scott. We have here *Sheol* portrayed as a community of the dead who step forward to greet the newly arrived dead king (p. 254). Whitehouse (*Century Bible, Isaiah*, Vol. I) and Skinner (*Cambridge Bible, Isaiah I-XXXIX*) agree substantially that the word should be translated "underworld." While Skinner says that the Greek *hades* is almost an exact equivalent of the Hebrew *Sheol*, Whitehouse states that there is no trace in the Old Testament of the idea that this abode is one of punishment for the wicked.

Let us now examine the evidence of the passage for ourselves.

1. In vs. 9a we read, "*Sheol* beneath is stirred up." This expression supports the idea that *Sheol* is an "underworld."
2. Also in vs. 9 we read that *Sheol* incites its inhabitants to action and in vs. 10 they speak. *Sheol* here seems to have activation forces—"it rouses the shades." The inhabitants are not in a completely unconscious state.
3. This is also a place where "maggots are the bed beneath you, and worms are your covering" (R.S.V.). There are insects of the earth. They shall cover the one who is thrown into *Sheol*.

In conclusion *Sheol* is presented in this passage as being the grave, a general receptacle for all who die. There is no sense here of *Sheol* being a place of punishment for the wicked.

Rephaim in the primary meaning as given by Koehler is "shades" or "ghosts." The ghosts of the dead are referred to as dwelling in *Sheol*. Gesenius states that the Hebrews supposed these "shades" to be destitute of blood and animal life (*nephesh*), but yet not wholly without some

faculties of mind; Ps. 88:11; Prov. 2:18, 9:18, 21:16; Isaiah 14:9, 26:14, 19. Whitehouse says what is depicted here is a "pale shadowy world of spirits who continue to exist" (p. 193). Gray and Scott say about the same. At this point I would like to quote Delitzsch, who makes a very interesting and substantial contribution to this idea of *rephaim*. "The mythological idea of Hades proceeds from the twofold truth, that what a man has been, and how he has been, in this world, is not extinguished in the other, but essentially revealed; and that there is an immaterial form assumed by the soul; in which all that man has become, in God-given relations, by his own self-determination, is reflected as in a mirror and that as an abiding picture. This soul-image, to which the dead body is related as the broken mould of a cast, is the shadowy corporeality of the inhabitants of Hades, in which they appear essentially, although ghost-wise, as that which they were in this world (*op. cit.*, p. 275).

Sheol is then on the basis of this passage the underworld abode or habitation (grave) of the dead. These dead exist in a ghost-like fashion (*rephaim*—shades), not in a completely unconscious state. It is no regard of persons, for the kings of the nations are here, deprived of all their pomp and splendor.

Our knowledge of our subject must not be confined to one passage, therefore, we shall make a limited survey of the Old Testament in order to receive a more complete picture of the teaching on *Sheol*. In the course of our survey we will endeavor to answer the following questions: What is it? Where is it? Who goes there? and, In what state of existence are they? After once going in, can one be brought out of *Sheol*? What is the significance of *Sheol* in regards to the Christian today?

WHAT IS IT?

I would like to introduce this section by quoting A. B. Davidson in his book, *The Theology of the Old Testament*. "That is a representation, according to which *Sheol* is a vast underground mausoleum, with cells all around like graves. But it may be asserted with some reason that nowhere is *Sheol* confounded with the grave, or the word used for the place of the dead body. *Sheol* is the place of the departed personalities—the Old Testament neither calls them 'souls' nor 'spirits'. It is the place appointed for all living, the great rendezvous of dead persons; for a strict distinction is not drawn between the body and its place, and the soul and its place" (p. 426). By way of detailed description according to the Old Testament we find that it is a land of forgetfulness (Ps. 88:12). It is compared to a house having gates, chambers, and bars. It is likened to a hungry beast that is never satisfied (Isa. 5:14; Heb. 2:5; Prov. 27:20, 30:15f). It is described as a "dark gloomy region, where the inhabitants pass a conscious, but dull, inactive existence (II Sam. 22:6; Ps. 6:5; Eccl. 9:10) (*Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*). It is the abode of the dead,

where they are gathered in tribes and families (Gen. 15:15; 25:8, 17; 49:33; Num. 20:24, 28; 31:3; Deut. 32:50).

WHERE IS IT?

The basic concept, as to where *Sheol* was located according to the Old Testament writers, is that it was beneath the earth's surface. This is evident from the passage studied above and also from the following passages among others: Gen. 37:35; Ezek. 31:15, 17; Num. 16:30-33; Amos 9:2. Thus one is said to go down into *Sheol*, (Job. 7:9, 21:13; Gen. 37:35; I Sam. 2:6; I Kings 2:6). It is also conceived of as being very deep, (Deut. 32:22; Job 11:8; Ps. 86:13). In Isa. 38:10 *Sheol* is pictured as being entered through gates. In Num. 16:20ff. we have the account of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram being swallowed up by the earth, thus descending into *Sheol*. One who narrowly escapes death is thought of as being "brought up" from *Sheol* (I Sam. 2:6; Job 33:24, 28, 30; Ps. 9:13). Thus it was an expression of the day that "the deepest thing conceivable is said to be 'deeper than *Sheol*' (Job 11:8), and the depths of *Sheol* are often contrasted with the heights of heaven (Job 11:8; Ps. 138:8; Isa. 7:11; Amos 9:2)" (Lewis B. Paton, "The Hebrew Idea of the Future Life," *The Biblical World*, March, 1910).

WHO GOES THERE? AND IN WHAT STATE OF EXISTENCE ARE THEY?

"To this gloomy realm all must one day go, great and small, good and bad. Those who have had bitter experience of the misery of the life on earth may covet the release, where 'the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest'; to those who have rounded out their years, it is the appointed end; but to be cut off out of the land of the living and sent down to *Sheol* in God's anger before one's time is the direst doom of the wicked" (George Foot Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. II, p. 290). These people are characterized by a cessation of all that characterize life except existence. Thus their personalities are powerless, drowsy, silent, almost as though in a deep sleep. Existence is such a state is the basis for their name *rephaim* or "shades." Davidson says these particular descriptive ideas of the Old Testament writers are not to be taken as matters of faith, but are the result of the writer's (and the Hebrew people's) imagination as a result of their contemplating the abode of the dead (*op. cit.*, p. 427). As illustrations of his point of view he suggests the following: They shuddered at the thought of it (death) and so pictured it as being dark and distant; the idea of grave suggested to them a cavernous receptacle; the sleep of death suggested stillness and silence; the flacid corpse suggested feebleness having no energy and no power of resistance. He says "only this is certain, that there was a belief in the continual existence of the person. Death puts an end to the existence of no person" (p. 428).

Let us now proceed to the scriptural evidences for the present question. There is no distinction between good and evil. All go into *Sheol* at

death (Job 3:17-19; I Sam. 28:19; Eccl. 9:5). It is a place where there are no punishments or rewards. Nothing is known to them of what happens in the upper world (Job 14:21). And yet in other places we read that they were conscious of events on earth (Isa. 14:9f; Ezek. 32:31; Jer. 31:15; Isa. 63:16; I Sam. 28:16-19). This was not regarded as a state of unconsciousness—the art of necromancy rested on the idea of communication between the world above and that below (Deut. 18:11). So Samuel could be called forth from the dead (I Sam. 28:11-15). In the passage which we studied above, *Sheol* was stirred at the descent of the King of Babylon (Isa. 14:9f). Another important concept is that those in *Sheol* are not removed from God's jurisdiction (Job 26:6; Ps. 139:8; Deut. 32:22; Prov. 15:11). Hosea uses the figure that God shall destroy *Sheol* (13:14). In Amos 9:2 it is stated that one cannot escape God by hiding in *Sheol*. But conversely one is not able to praise God from *Sheol* (Ps. 6:5), although Jonah uses the figure that he cried out of its depth (Jonah 2:2). *Sheol* is said to be a cruel place (Song of Sol. 8:6) and in Isaiah 14:11, as pointed out previously, the grave is no respecter of persons.

We also find passages which refer to *Sheol* as a place where the wicked dwell after or in death. Many scholars feel that this is probably in large measure a post-exilic development (Ps. 49:14; 9:17; Num. 16:33; Hab. 2:5). In Ezek. 31:16, 17 we read that whole nations were cast into *Sheol*. It is also pictured as being or having within it burning fire (Deut. 32:22; Song of Sol. 8:6). The Old Testament at least alludes to the possibility of one escaping *Sheol* (Ps. 49:15; 89:48; 86:13; Hos. 13:14; Prov. 23:15). James Orr writing in *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, (p. 2762), in reference to the above states "... in the post-canonical Jewish literature (apoc. and apocalyptic) a very considerable development is manifest in the idea of *Sheol*. Distinction between good and bad in Israel is emphasized; *Sheol* becomes for certain classes an intermediate state between death and resurrection; for the wicked and for Gentiles it is nearly a synonym for Gehenna (hell)." Earlier he says that in relation to immortality we must view *Sheol* in relation to death which is unnatural in that it is a result of sin; therefore the believers hope for the future was not prolonged confinement in *Sheol*, "but deliverance from it and restoration to new life in God's presence (Job 14:13-15; 19:25-27; Ps. 16:10, 11; 17:15; 49:15, 73:24-26)."

WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE?

By the previous two statements we have already delved into this area of our discussion. It should be noted here that G. Dalman in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Vol. 5, pp. 109-110) and A. B. Davidson hold a somewhat developmental view of *Sheol*. The former holds that the Jewish view of *Sheol* underwent modification during the 3rd century B.C. at the hands of the Pharisaic doctrine and the

Essenic doctrine. According to the Pharisaic doctrine, it was held that at the end of the world there would be a return of part or all of the pious dead to this life (cf. Isa. 36:19; Dan. 12:2; Enoch 90:33). The Essenic doctrine held that all the pious would be taken up to God like Enoch (cf. Ps. 73:24; Wisd. of Sol. 3:1; Enoch 39:5).

The latter states, "Towards the close of the Hebrew Commonwealth, another idea began to rise—that of a gloomy vale of horrid sufferings through the torturings of fire." This idea of *Sheol* had its basis in the concept of Gehenna. Gehenna has its background in the rites of Moloch, where children were sacrificed in the Hinnom valley by making them pass through this place of fire. He says that this is a New Testament advance on the doctrine. Let it suffice to say here that the development character or aspects of *Sheol* should be understood insofar as it is a part of God's progressive revelation to his people.

A predominantly New Testament interpretation is given by William G. T. Shedd on the subject of *Sheol* in his *Dogmatic Theology* (Vol. II, pp. 624-640). The crux of his interpretation is bound up in this statement, "As in English, 'death' may mean either physical or spiritual death, so in Hebrew, *Sheol* may mean either the grave or hell." This was pointed out in our earlier question concerning the exegesis of the Isaiah 14 passage. Following we shall give a brief statement of his outline, omitting scripture texts as we have already cited them above. First the ideas supporting the concept of *Sheol* as being a place of future punishment: a. It is a place where the wicked or evil are sent. These wicked are warned of the impending danger. There is also a judgment of God in which he sends the wicked to punishment and rewards the righteous. b. There is no other proper name for the place of punishment. c. In the same passages which speak of the dark abode for the wicked, there is spoken of in contrast, a bright abode of blessedness for the righteous. d. When the term *Sheol* is used as a place of death, a "spiritual death is implied as well as physical." Here we get our first New Testament parallel. "*Sheol* is as inseparably associated with spiritual death and perdition, in the Old Testament, as Hades is in the New Testament, and as Hell is in the common phraseology of the Christian Church" (p. 632). His ideas on the concept of *Sheol* as the grave has many more references to the New Testament. a. When *Sheol* means grave, only the body goes into *Sheol*. So we have in the New Testament Christ's body being raised after three days. b. The grave has gloomy associations for the wicked and the righteous. All shrink from the grave. He says, contrasting that day and this, that even though "Christ has brought immortality to light in the Gospel" yet our faith is still weak and needs the support of God. c. As a result the wicked shall remain in *Sheol* while the righteous body shall be resurrected to glory.

In conclusion Shedd makes the following statement: "From this examination of texts, it appears that *Sheol*, in the Old Testament, has the same

two significations that Hades has in the New. The only difference is, that in the Old Testament, Sheol less often, in proportion to the whole number of instances, denotes 'hell,' and more often the 'grave,' than Hades does in the New Testament. And this, for the reason that the doctrine of future retribution was more fully revealed and developed by Christ and his apostles, than it was by Moses and the Prophets" (p. 639).

To a certain extent Shedd is correct, however we feel that he takes a rather large jump in order to come to the conclusion that *Sheol* and Hades are practically synonymous. From our investigation of the Old Testament usage of the word Sheol we have come to the following conclusions:

1. *Sheol* is an abode of the dead. There is here no moral distinction between the good and the bad. Persons do not cease to exist when they pass into this state. The inhabitants of *Sheol* are referred to as *rephaim* and are characterized as existing in a type of semi-conscious state, as mere shadows, shades, or ghosts of what they were in their earthly existence. As one reads the passages where *Sheol* is referred to it is not hard to understand the position of some of the scholars when they say that many of the specific characteristics attributed to *Sheol* are a result of the Hebrew mind as he faced death and the grave about which there was much uncertainty.

2. Although the Old Testament teaches that all are to go into *Sheol*, yet this is not characterized as being the finale of life. There was a hope and an expectation on the part of the righteous that they would be delivered from *Sheol*. "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave: for he shall receive me" (Ps. 49:1, cf. also 86:13 and Hos. 13:14). Job in chapter 19:25-27 pleads for a vindicator. It is evident that he expects God to vindicate him beyond *Sheol*.

3. In contrast to the above we also see the germ of the idea which undergoes further development in the intertestamental period, that *Sheol* is a place where the wicked are sent. In this sense then it is characterized as a place of punishment. This position is set forth by the Old Testament most explicitly in Daniel 12:1, 2 and Psalm 49:13, 14, 15. References about this are found largely in the books of Enoch and II Esdras which show the development of the torment idea for the wicked in Sheol.

Although this article is written to shed light on the Old Testament teaching and use of the concept of Sheol, its significance for the Christian today should be pointed out. This significance is manifest in that the Christian today as he reads the Old Testament and the New Testament is able to see that the Old Testament people had a vague notion of what was involved in death and after death in comparison to the great deal of light which is shed in the New Testament. The Christian sees in this area of study God's progressive revelation. Even in the Old Testament there was hope and an expectation of future blessedness for the righteous with God and the germ of an expectation of spiritual death for the wicked. But it comes to its fullest fruition in the New Testament as a result of and through the revelation of God in Christ and his redemptive work.

CAMPUS HIGHLIGHTS

The Adelpic Society began its activities this year with a picnic September 18 at Camp Geneva at which President John R. Mulder gave a short address welcoming the new students to our campus. It is aim of the Adelpic Society to present a comprehensive program for the students that will help to prepare them for varied fields of service. Some highlights of the fall program have been: A talk on the work of the Chaplaincy by Dr. Raymond Van Heukelom; the address by Dr. Louis H. Benes on the publication of the Church Herald; the discussion of the subject "Puritanism" by the Rev. Harold Englund; and Dr. Henry Bast's address on the radio ministry of Temple Time. One meeting in every month was sponsored by the Goyim Missionary Fellowship and was devoted to the cause of missions both domestic and foreign. A special feature of the fall program was our joint meeting with Calvin Seminary in Grand Rapids on Nov. 6. Dr. William Spoelhof, President of Calvin College, spoke on the timely subject (for election night), "The Dependence of Democracy on Christian Principles."

Mr. Henry Tyse has completed a series of eight lectures to the Adelpia Society on the use of visual aids in the Church. This informative study will be followed in the second quarter by a series by President Mulder on the Heidelberg Catechism. Adelpia Society

also sponsored the annual Christmas party held Dec. 10 in the Commons. An enjoyable program was presented by the children of our Seminary families after which a bountiful lunch was served.

A welcome visitor to our campus Dec. 6-7 was Dr. Markus Barth from the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago. His lectures on the "Christological Significance of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel" were extremely stimulating and provoked discussion in the seminary halls for many days. We all appreciated his new and original insights into this important subject.

Nov. 20 marked the successful completion of the second annual "Operation: Missions" drive at the seminary. For the second straight year the pledges far exceeded the goal that was set by the Goyim Missionary Fellowship, sponsors of the drive. This year over \$4200.00 was pledged to be distributed in three new areas of extension work on the west coast. Activities of the day included an all-seminary breakfast with the Rev. Henry Kik presiding, the showing of the film "Vistas of Vision" demonstrating the work done by the six students in California this past summer, a potluck supper for the entire seminary family arranged by the Adelpia Society, and the evening service at which the Rev. Wilbur Ringnald of Fremont, Mich. gave the "Challenge of California."

With the beginning of our Christmas vacation Saturday noon, Dec. 15, most of us look forward to spending the holidays with our families. We look ahead to the new year at the seminary with a sense of anticipation, praying God's blessing upon all those connected with this work of training young men for his service.

The seminary congratulates Donald Bruggink, '54, on receiving his Doctor of Philosophy degree. The degree was conferred by the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, October 20, 1956. The subject of the dissertation for the degree is "The Theology of Thomas Boston, 1676-1732."

BOOK REVIEWS

The Cross in the Old Testament, by H. Wheeler Robinson, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. Pp. 192. \$3.00.

H. Wheeler Robinson has long been recognized as an eminent writer, Biblical scholar and Christian theologian. This book substantiates his position. His fluid style of writing enthalls the lay reader as well as the theologian; his mature scholarship challenges the finest critic; and his fervent spirit warms the devoted Christian.

The Cross in the Old Testament is a one volume presentation of three separate works, namely *The Cross of Job*, *The Cross of the Servant* and *The Cross of Jeremiah*. In each work the author scrutinizes the page of the Old Testament through the spectacles of the New. He makes no apology for this approach: quite the contrary, constant emphasis is given to the interrelations of the Old and New Testaments.

The Cross of Job develops the problem of suffering in the traditional manner, progressing from the viewpoint of Job to that of his friends and ultimately to the purposes of the Divine. The treatment is unique in that it projects beyond the usual interpretations of Job which find the resolution of the problem of innocent suffering in the divine utterances that teach the lesson of humility. Robinson's distinctive emphasis and contribution is that such suffering may unconsciously serve the divine purpose. The source for this development is found in the Prologue (1:6-12, 2:1-6). It is God who first calls attention to Job, God who permits the trial of his faith, God who watches the experiment and assigns the proper limits. Throughout it is the will of God that is being done (pp. 46, 57). There is a divine purpose in this innocent suffering other than retribution or discipline,

which purpose is to prove that disinterested religion and piety is a reality: that man can hold to God, not for what he gives but for himself. Job is a witness for God. Men often speak of trusting God: the neglected truth, Robinson maintains, is that God is trusting man.

The Cross of the Servant focuses thought on the four Songs of the Servant as found in Isaiah 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, and 52:13—53:12. To the uninitiated student this work can be of inestimable value; to the advanced student there is much that is elemental. In concise form the author discusses subjects upon which volumes have been written. The familiar arguments, pro and con, for the identification of the Servant of Yahweh are set forth. The concepts of suffering in the portrait of the Servant are presented including the Jewish interpretation. To the reviewer the most significant contribution of the work is the treatment of the concept of corporate personality to clarify the Servant passages (pp. 76-78). The ancient sense of corporate personality embodies the idea that to the primitive man the group is all. A person finds himself in the group, but he never finds himself. He is not a personality, but one of the bearers of a type-personality. He is summed up in the group, clan or tribe. In this characteristic of primitive thought there is a fluidity of conception, a possibility of swift transition from the one to the many, and vice versa, to which our thought and language have no real parallel. This trait of passing from the one to the many, and from the many to the one, appears often in the Hebrew speech and thought of the Old Testament. As an example, Achan's whole family is destroyed as a penalty for his personal act (cf. also Num. 20:18, 19, Dan. 7:13, 27, and Ps. 22). On this basis Robinson very cogently and convincingly explains the perplexing variety of interpretations given by modern scholars to the Servant of Yahweh passages. The prophet's mind held together

what many today have only regarded as distinct.

The Cross of Jeremiah reviews in succession the literary structure and form of Jeremiah's prophecy; the life of Jeremiah as related to his environment; the life of Jeremiah in terms of inner experience and personal religion; and finally the revelation of God's nature through Jeremiah's experience. It is in the latter two areas that the author ascends the heights and sets forth Jeremiah as revealing the noblest concepts of personal fellowship with God contained in the Old Testament. Jeremiah pioneers a personal religion that leads one to the threshold of the deeper understandings of the New Testament. The highest knowledge of Yahweh is to be found, not in an intellectual system of belief, but in a personal fellowship with the Holy One (p. 185).

In all three of the Crosses of the Old Testament the author sees the same basic result and purpose in the suffering and rejection of a man of God. As each sufferer bears his cross and stands alone against the weight of an older, narrower tradition, there is a new understanding of God related in each experience. In fact, a synthesis is made of these new understandings. The contribution of personal religion (Jeremiah) is made through a life of sacrificial suffering (Servant) which has an intrinsic value to God (Job). In relating the Crosses of the Old Testament to the Cross of Calvary Robinson writes, "so we may think of the offering of the Cross of Calvary as the offering of personal religion, realized in sacrifice, and having in itself—not in any penalty artificially inflicted on it—but in itself, in what it is, a positive value to God" (p. 190).

Higher critics may argue some of the Old Testament introductory problems contained in the book, e.g. the date of Job or the Deutero-Isaiah problem, but no one can question the warmth of the author's personal devotion to God and his Word.

—HENRY VOOGD

Luther's Work (Volume 12, Selected Psalms I), edited by Jaroslav Pelikan, Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955. Pp. xi-418.

This is the initial volume of a great undertaking. We are informed that 55 volumes of Luther's works are to be translated and published in English! The intention is to make Luther speak English even as he made the Scriptures speak the language of the German people. The translators therefore are free to recast sentences and even paragraphs for purposes of clarity and readability. The four translators have achieved well and have given us both the thought and the dynamic of the great Reformer.

This volume gives Luther's exposition of seven Psalms: 2, 8, 19, 23, 26, 45, 51. The expositions vary in length—the two longest are of 45 and 51 each of which covers more than 100 pages, and the shortest is on 26 with 12 pages. The Weimar edition is used as the text although this is checked against other editions.

This is a commentary different from the present day understanding of a commentary. In some instances Luther appears as a classroom lecturer, in other cases as a preacher instructing and admonishing his congregation and also as an informal conversationalist in his *Table Talk* with his family and friends. However, in every case he diligently takes hold of the Scripture and through his own particular method interprets the Word and in his peculiar way makes that Word relevant to the *Sitz im Leben*.

The commentary is intensely Christological. This is what one would expect from Luther. Yet one may wonder whether the Psalms had a meaning for the day in which they were given. Luther is not interested in the historical setting of the poet, for with giant strides he places himself in the New Testament or in the Christological controversies of the first centuries and uses e.g. Psalm 2 for the Virgin Birth

or for the eternal generation of the Son. Had he followed the New Testament more closely, he would have noted that Paul in Acts 13:33 relates Psalm 2:7, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," to the resurrection of Christ (cf. also Romans 1:4); or that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews relates this same passage to the appointment of Christ as priest after the order of Melchizedek (5:5). Could it be that Calvin in his commentary on this Psalm tilts against Luther as follows, "This passage, I am aware, has been explained as referring to the eternal generation of Christ; and from the words *this day*, they have reasoned ingeniously as if they denoted an eternal act without any relation to time" (*Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, Edinburgh: 1845, vol. I, p. 18)? Calvin is close to present day interpreters on the word "I have begotten thee" (*yeladbtikha*) which indicates appointment or manifestation. This was the case as David was set as king on Zion's holy hill and so this word is used by Paul for the manifestation of Christ's sonship at his resurrection.

To cite points of difference in exegesis is a comparatively easy thing to do, yet it is at such variations that we may detect points of view. The interesting though obscure expression of the psalmist, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou established strength, because of thine adversaries" (8:2), is interpreted to mean that the Word of God even though spoken in weakness is the only effective means of overcoming the enemy (pp. 107 ff). Luther must resort to begging of exegesis so that "babes and sucklings" who cannot speak intelligently about the Word are the simple unsophisticated people to whom God has revealed himself as Jesus said in Matthew 11:25. Luther knew the power of the spoken Word. However, the psalmist saw the majesty of God in the starry heaven and the marvelous power in the innocent prattle of a babe. Had the psalmist possibly observed the quieting

of a raging warrior by the winsomeness of a child?

The psalmist in the above psalm evidently viewed the heavens at night and therefore he sang, "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained" (v. 3). Luther detects that sun is missing here. This he explains by stating that the sun often symbolizes Christ (e.g. Malachi 4:2; Psalms 19:5; 104:22, 23!) and therefore it would be improper to consider the sun as a work of God's fingers. Rather the sun is described in v. 4, "What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou dost care for him?" (p. 122). Since verse four is used messianically in Hebrews 2:6ff, it gives the right to consider it here as referring to the Messiah who is thus the "sun." This seems to be Luther's process of thought. Even though the passage in question together with the following verses is used by the writer to the Hebrews as descriptive of the *true* man in Jesus Christ—this Luther rightly affirms—yet in the psalm we have a reference to man or mankind under the gracious visitation of God.

It is with amazement that I note a different translation of 8:6 [Eng. 5]. "Thou wilt let him be forsaken of God for a little while, but thou wilt crown him with honor and adornment." This is not a translation of the German Bible commonly ascribed to Luther, "*Du hast ihm wenig niedriger gemacht denn Gott, und mit Ehre und Schmuck hast du ihm gekroent.*" With this startling change in translation Luther finds this text a prophecy of the humiliation and exaltation of Christ. Other variations chiefly in tenses of verbs also occur in this psalm.

Certain outstanding features of Luther's method should be pointed out. A man coming out of many conflicts and also being in many, as Luther was, will call attention to the enemies of Christ and his Church. These enemies are the pope, the papists, the Turk (Islam) and the anabaptist all of whom are the instruments of Satan. Neither

does he spare men such as Carlstadt and Zwingli who are fabricators of empty speculations (p. 49). This is Luther's way of making the message relevant.

Luther had little interest in understanding the background of the psalms. Calvin is remarkably different at this point. Commentaries of the past two decades have a vast array of hymns and liturgies of Israel's neighbors by which to compare and contrast the psalms of David. These psalms therefore become Israel's singing credo in clear contrast to the worship in pagan temples. And so it must be that Israel had her songs for pilgrimages to the temple, for enthronement of the king, for gathering of crops and for many other occasions.

Luther is a Christian preacher. That is to say, he relates the Psalms to Christ and the New Testament. One may not approve his free exegesis, but one is captivated by his evangelical fervor. Certainly every Christian preacher can take a page from the works of Luther by confronting the congregation with Jesus Christ even as the evangelists of the New Testament did who took their start in the Old Testament and brought the message of the Old Testament to its consummation in Jesus Christ. This will be preaching, i.e. Christian preaching, at its best.

—LESTER J. KUYPER

Jesus Christ the Risen Lord, by Floyd V. Filson, New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. Pp. 5-288. \$4.00.

Professor Filson has made several notable contributions to biblical theology in the recent years, both by way of translation of significant foreign works and his own writings, but *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord* represents his own first full-scale biblical theology. It is an important and interesting book and fulfills in delightful fashion the author's intent to provide "an essay in biblical theology."

An opening chapter explains the author's point of view and method, and

it is that of *Heilsgeschichte*, God's redemptive work in history, culminating in the Christian Gospel in which the resurrection of Jesus Christ has the interpreting and leading role. The adoption of the Resurrection as the crystallization point for theology requires some defense and exposition, and this is provided in a second chapter entitled "Christ the Risen Lord." Here Filson shows convincingly that the resurrection of Jesus was central in the earliest Christian preaching, and that it provides a true starting-place for the study of the message and meaning of the New Testament. In this connection there is provided a detailed outline of the *kerygma*, the essentials of the common New Testament preaching (pp. 41-54), and this common gospel is shown to be reflected in the New Testament writings generally, thus establishing the unity of the New Testament. The remaining chapters of the book develop in more detail the points of the common gospel and present successive discussions of Israel, the Old Testament, the Kingdom, the Cross, God the Father, the Spirit, the Church, the Christian, and the Final Goal. The eight chapters dealing with these several points of the common apostolic message comprise the bulk of the book, and present Filson's concept and content of biblical theology.

The positions advanced, for the most part, are sound and solidly based in the New Testament message. To emphasize *Heilsgeschichte* and the kerygmatic unity of the New Testament is fashionable today (so Dodd, Hunter, Stauffer, etc.), but more importantly, it is biblically sound. These features should not be summarily dismissed by labeling them "neo-orthodox." Our older conservative biblical theologians tended to present the unity of scripture largely or solely in terms of its divine inspiration and canonization. This was, as Bo Reicke has said "a unity-*thesei*," a unity divinely imposed upon scripture. Biblical theologians today tend to present the unity of scripture largely or solely in

terms of a common message, "a unity-*phusei*," a unity natural to and inherent in the scripture itself (cf. Bo Reicke, "Einheitlichkeit oder verschiedene 'Lehrebegriffe' in der neutestamentlichen Theologie," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 1953). It is time that this tension between the older and newer scholarship be resolved, and that both recognize the true worth of the dual unity of scripture, the unity of its form and content. Signs of the *rapprochement* are already at hand in the recent work of Dr. Herman Ridderbos, *Heilsgeschiedenis en Heilige Schrift van het Nieuwe Testament* (1955). Many other commendable features in Filson's book deserve acknowledgement, but only a few can be mentioned here. Students especially will appreciate the succinct and valuable summaries of essential New Testament materials on many points of the common apostolic message. The expositions are notably free from doctrinal and exegetical eccentricities, and quite well supported by appropriate scriptural documentation. The author does not hesitate to give some judicious and necessary counsel on the dangers of C. H. Dodd's oversharpe distinction between *kerygma* and *didache* (pp. 33ff) and his overemphasis on "realized eschatology" (pp. 43f, 102ff), and on the danger of rejecting the consistent testimony of the New Testament regarding the deity of Christ and his Messianic consciousness (pp. 152ff). The book is brief, compactly written, wonderfully lucid, and students of biblical theology will find it easy and interesting reading. And since there is such a dearth of up-to-date theologies of the New Testament, all New Testament students are indebted to Dr. Filson for providing us with this very usable and attractive handbook.

While not unappreciative of the commendable qualities of this book, the brevity of many of its expositions of the common Christian message and the paucity of exegetical support for several of the conclusions advanced, leave the reader with an impression of vague

generality. Since biblical theology is presumably a branch of exegetical theology, a student expects to encounter some of the exegetical sub-structure which supports the theological conclusions advanced. Filson's book provides us mainly with the theological conclusions, no sub-structure, and thus one is left with a sense of lack of depth. Professor Filson assuredly possesses a very adequate exegetical sub-structure for his theological conclusions, but it is not apparent here and one wishes that he had allowed it larger expression and visibility. As it stands written, one must rest content with theological conclusions supported only by a string of biblical references, and sometimes even the reference-string is a short one. A particularly glaring example of this is in chapter seven "Christ and the Father," where the relationship of Christ to the Father is presented in terms of the great designations "Lord," "Messiah," "Suffering Servant," "Son of Man," etc. These titles receive such scanty exegetical attention that one is given no accurate impression whatsoever of their scriptural importance and justification. Complaint cannot be registered against the author for failure to cite sufficient scripture. The indices to Stauffer's theology reveal twelve pages of scriptural citation references. Frederick Grant's book reveals five pages of references. Filson's book contains an index which runs to about five pages, which indicates a generous amount of scriptural reference. Complaint may be made, however, against his practice of listing texts rather than discussing them, and allowing them to enter into the actual sub-structure of his theological positions.

The feature of the book which is bound to excite the most attention is the author's decision to organize his material about the Resurrection of Christ. In his preface (p. 5) he tells us that he came to this decision after trying out on his students many patterns of presentation. He contends that "biblical theology finds its clearest

starting point and interpreting clue in the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (p. 25). A little later he reasserts his basic contention, "The entire New Testament was written from the post-resurrection viewpoint. Even when the writers do not mention the Resurrection, they speak from the life outlook of a church that lives in the glow of the resurrection faith" (p. 29). Now Filson is not alone, of course, in this contention. E. Michael Ramsey gave his support to this contention in his modest essay in biblical theology, *The Resurrection of Christ* (1946), and said that he had learned this approach from the lectures of the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns who insisted that any course in the Theology and Ethics of the New Testament had to begin with the Resurrection. Walter Kunneth also pointed out the dogmatic significance and centrality of the Resurrection in his *Theologie der Auferstehung* (1933). Since the New Testament itself articulates a structuring of thought and presentation about the Resurrection of Christ, there is much to command such a method of organization. In any use of the Resurrection as a starting point or organizing point, however, it must be kept clearly in view that the centre of the apostolic message is Crucifixion-Resurrection, and as Ramsey says, "Not Crucifixion alone nor Resurrection alone, nor even the Crucifixion as the prelude and the Resurrection as the finale, but the blending of the two in a way that is as real to the Gospel as it is defiant to the world" (*ibid.*, p. 20).

The puzzling thing about this basic approach of Filson is that, after adopting it, he does not take it seriously enough. If the resurrection of Jesus is the central interpreting fact of our New Testament, of our apostolic faith, then it certainly deserves extended exposition and emphasis. And yet so very little is said here about resurrection, either that of Jesus or that of the believer or of general resurrection. Even the final chapter on "Christ and the Final Goal" contains only two pages

on the topic of the resurrection of the dead, and the discussion remains quite general, aloof from real exegetical grappling with the subject.

The precise bearing of the Resurrection of Christ on all the points of the *kerygma* is also left unstated and uninterpreted. This is especially noticeable in chapter six "Christ and the Cross," where several important aspects of the death of Christ are clearly set forth. The substitutionary character of Christ's death is discussed (p. 128). The only discussion of the bearing of the Resurrection on the death of Christ, however, is the brief acknowledgement:

The Resurrection throws light on all this meaning of the Cross, but the Resurrection does not crowd out the fact of the Cross or its vital role in expressing the very nature of God, of Christ, and of Christian living. This will become clear as we see how the entire career of Jesus of Nazareth blends with the Cross into one consistent picture (p. 131).

One naturally expects at this point the kind of exposition which was promised at the outset where the author says of this resurrection fact, "In the light of this fact the Crucifixion found its Christian interpretation" (p. 28). The Christian interpretation of the Cross is here, but as elsewhere in the book, the reader is left to assume that the interpretation is what it is because of the Resurrection. Nowhere is this bearing of the centrality of the Resurrection on the points of the *kerygma* formally set forth in detailed fashion.

And finally, does one speak of Resurrection in a matter-of-fact manner? The author makes references to the resurrection of Jesus and writes about it as the crystallizing point for theology with the same unexcited, unaffected air that one would exercise in announcing the next hymn in a service of morning worship. Does one speak *so* of the Resurrection? Resurrection is wonderful, spiritual, and hard to understand, the crisis of every human temporal

thing. It is mysterious, paradoxical, overpowering. To speak and write of the empty tomb, his victory and our victory, the forgiveness of sins, the defeat of sin, curse and death, means that one knows that which surpasses knowledge. Resurrection is scandal to the world, the reality of all realities to faith only.

—RICHARD C. OUDERSLUYS

Taught By The Master, by Clarence W. Cranford, Nashville: Broadman Press, 1956. Pp. vii-122. \$2.00.

This small volume is one of those publications which had its beginning in a series of lectures by its author. Dr. Cranford, the popular pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church in Washington, D. C., originally gave the material in a series of lectures to an interdenominational group of Church school teachers and workers. This book attempts to outline the teaching ministry of Jesus in some of its ramifications in the hope that "something in these pages will turn the reader back to a new study of the Gospels themselves, and to him who is the master Teacher of all times" (p. viii). Intended for Christian pastor and layman alike, its purpose is frankly inspirational.

With this background we may proceed to some discussion of the author's presentation. His starting point is Evangelical Protestant Christianity. Unlike so many who delight in calling Jesus the "master Teacher," our author points him out as the One who came not only to teach but, first of all, to save. Yet Christ was a great Teacher and his teachings deserve earnest and attentive study in our times.

Chapter II, entitled "How He Taught," sets forth the methodology of Jesus' teaching ministry. "Long before psychology had been formulated as a science for studying human behavior, he followed its valid principles and pioneered in its methods" (p. 26). The

author shows on every page his keen insight into the effectiveness of the Master's teaching method and motives.

The next chapter, "His Purpose in Teaching," shows the redemptive nature of Jesus' entire ministry. His coming into the world was to give life in a new and abundant sense through trust in and fellowship with God. Jesus' teaching concerning this abundant life is described by Dr. Cranford with apt Scriptural illustrations.

The content of Christ's teaching, in its broad outlines, is the subject matter of the next three chapters. Jesus' revelation of God as a Personality who acts and makes himself known as self-giving love in the cross is delineated as well as his unique perception of man as an individual—a sinner yet one who is worth saving. The theme of our Lord's teaching was the Kingdom of God: inward and spiritual, established by mutual love, costly yet rewarding, here and yet to come.

Finally, the author points to the "New Kind of Discipleship" which Jesus originated. The way to succeed, said Jesus is to serve. Applying this to the Church, Dr. Cranford speaks prophetically when he says, "When the Church loses its urge to serve, it loses its power to save." (p. 108). And again, "The Church can claim only one right, and that is the right to represent the ever-living Christ in his ministry of love and service, and to present the claims and promises of Christ to sinful men" (p. 110.)

This reviewer feels that the author has achieved in a remarkable way in this short and inspiring book. His extensive use of Scriptural illustrations is greatly appreciated, and his unusual ability to state much of his material in pithy contrasts makes this book one which "sticks" in the mind. An example will suffice to show what we mean. "Jesus came, therefore, not to make us more learned, but more loving; not to impart new facts, but to inspire new faith" (p. 36). One

L
lays this book down with a sense of warmth generated by the presentation of him who is the master Teacher for our time and for all time. Each one of us needs to be "taught by the Master."

—ROD JACKSON

The Man Who Would Preach, by Robert E. Keighton, New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. Pp. 7-128. \$2.00.

S
The full title of this book is, *The Man Who Would Preach, His Nature, Calling and Work*. From this title one would expect that the purpose of the book is to make a thorough study of the preacher from these three points of view. I found it not so. In the Foreword the author seems to define his efforts as an examination of various difficulties, frustrations and pitfalls of the ministry. This he does with a degree of success.

The dual value of the book for me was that of alternate deflation and elation. In the first chapters especially, the author attacks those categories by which ministers so often estimate themselves and incisively reveals the error of such judgment. He then turns our often reluctant eyes to the true purpose of preaching—that of bringing the congregation into closer relationship with God, and the true category for evaluating a sermon—the degree in which it achieves that purpose.

7
Having exposed these false approaches to preaching, the author goes on, especially in the last chapters and the Epilogue, to remind us of the glory of the ministry. He bemoans its loss of prestige and encourages an authoritative message.

Throughout the book, a neat, impressive turn of phrase often catches the mind's eye. For example, when talking about ministerial caution stemming from a feeling of inexperience, he says, "We cannot avoid the danger of being inadequate by choosing to be inarticulate"

(p. 35). The book makes pleasant reading and the overall effect on this reader was salutary.

Turning to possible criticism, I must say that I feel the book lacks any distinct unity. The chapter headings are picturesque but give no indication of their content nor of an overall direction of movement. The author makes abundant use of quotation, which adds somewhat to interest but subtracts from lucidity and progress of thought. At times the author seems overly concerned with dressing platitudes in expert phraseology to make them appear like great insights. In my estimation, Mr. Keighton's book is largely a collation of the scattered insights of his obviously rich experience. It lacks logical integration and systematic progression.

At the danger of entering on treacherous ground with an inadequate basis for judgment, I must confess that Mr. Keighton's book leaves me a little unsure of his theological dispositions. This stems not so much from what he says as what he does not say. While my feeling may have no real relation to the author's attitude, I would have liked to see him base his evaluation and exaltation of preaching on a more thoroughly biblical, Christocentric ground.

This book is very pleasant reading and eminently worthwhile for any minister so long as one does not expect from it a thorough, scholarly treatment of the subject.

—GARRETT WILTERDINK

The Early Church, by Oscar Cullmann, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. Pp. v-217. \$4.50.

The chapters which make up this book originated as ten separate articles which appeared in various periodicals from 1947 to 1954. This fact represents its major weakness as a book—an unevenness of thoroughness of presentation of subjects. The reader of *The Early Church* will delight, however, to follow

the brilliant logic of Professor Cullmann as he makes his way through several complicated theological and historical problems.

Chapters 1-4 provide an excellent demonstration of the methodology and accomplishments of "Historical Criticism." Chapter 1, "The Necessity and Function of Higher Criticism" presents some challenging thoughts among which is the idea that higher criticism is a methodology which must accompany exegesis *from its beginning to its end* (p. 16).

Chapter 2, "The Origin of Christmas," which combines encyclopedic knowledge with theological insight, is Cullmann's discussion of the traditional dates of the Christian Christmas celebration, the relationship of Christian to pagan festivals, and the diversified expression of the festival of Jesus' birth in various Christian traditions. Cullmann's whole analysis of the Christmas festival is orientated around the central events in the story of Christ: his death and resurrection. "His incarnation must be viewed in the light of these events, and not *vice versa*. From this standpoint the Christian year should begin not with Advent, but with the round of celebrations at Easter" (p. 34).

In Chapter 3, "The Plurality of the Gospels as a Theological Problem in Antiquity," Cullmann demonstrates how a number of Gospels including the present four canonical Gospels struggled for a place in the ancient church and how individual Gospels originally received favor primarily in separate areas of the early church. He explained why there are four Gospels: "The plurality of the Gospels, the fact that there are four Gospels, is simply an expression of the human way in which the Gospels originated" (p. 50). Cullmann, however, elsewhere demands: "The believer holds that these documents are not simply historical records . . . but that the Holy Spirit confronts the believing reader directly with Christ" (p. 81).

In Chapter 4, "The Tradition," Cullmann carries on his debate with Roman

Catholic authorities who had raised objections to his book *Peter*. The reader will find that his rebuttals to Roman Catholic criticism are but incidental to an elaboration of a very important theological historical principle: Christ, the exalted Lord, is "the real author of the whole tradition" which developed "within the apostolic Church. . . ." (p. 62). Cullmann denies that this high estimate of apostolic *paradosis* has the same normative import which the Roman Catholic church gave to the later ecclesiastical *paradosis*. For Cullmann the guarantee (within the church) for the correct interpretation of Scripture is founded in this formula: "The *Kyrios* is present in Scripture, and the Holy Spirit is present in the reader that has faith" (p. 99).

Whereas Chapters 1 to 4 deal with various aspects of historical studies, Chapters 5, 6, and 7 cover various aspects of eschatology. The first of these, Chapter 5, "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament," is a marvelous essay. In it Cullmann not only shows how closely these two separate concepts are associated in the New Testament but also how they are related both chronologically and theologically to the concept of the Kingdom of God. Although this reviewer considers this essay an excellent one, he finds in it two serious shortcomings which represent two basic defects in Cullmann's whole historical approach. Whereas Cullmann in analyzing and interpreting both the New Testament and early Christian times employs material from the writings of the Apostolic and Ante-Nicene Fathers to elaborate his interpretations, he does not employ material from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha as background for an understanding of the same literature and times. This makes his interpretation of the Apocalypse (cf. p. 122) and any of his references to the Son of Man (cf. p. 130) suffer from serious limitations. In addition, Cullmann does not distinguish sufficiently between the type of literature which the Apocalypse is and the type of literature which the Gospels and

the Pauline letters are. Some of Cullmann's views suffer from the same limitations that paralyze fundamentalistic eschatology. Chapter 7 on "The Proleptic Deliverance of the Body According to the New Testament" suffers from some of these basic inadequacies and in addition is not a consistent and coherent elaboration of this theme. Through a maze of unconnected detail Cullmann arrives at the conclusion that the resurrection of Christ has consequences for our bodies: "Here and now the body can be subject to the life-giving activity of the Holy Spirit, although its transformation into a spiritual body is only possible when all things shall be created anew by the Spirit" (p. 173).

In Chapter 6, "The Return of Christ," Cullmann strikes a wholesome median point of view between the liberals on the one hand who deny the return of Christ and the fundamentalists on the other hand who believe in the return of Christ but are totally absorbed in such specific details as the precise date and circumstances of his return. Cullmann believes Christ will return to earth, and as the first decisive event of his revelation took place on earth, so will his return take place on earth "because matter itself has to be re-created" (p. 147). For the church the hope of the return of Christ in the future presents a challenge for work in the present time. "It must pursue in this present age the work of Christ by living according to the Holy Spirit which has been given to it" (p. 159).

"He Who Comes After Me," Chapter 7, is a specialized study on the problem of the relationship of Jesus to John the Baptist (or the relationship of the early Christian Church to the Baptist movement). This chapter, which will be hard for those who are untutored in this specialized problem to understand, presents the thesis that John was accepted by some peoples in early times as the Messiah on the basis of the fact that he preceded Jesus. Cullmann elucidates the factor in Judaism that historical priority was the basis for spiritual su-

periority and demonstrates that the author of the Fourth Gospel used the same chronological argument and demonstrated that Jesus was actually first (cf. John 1).

The reader will get a new understanding of John 4 from "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission," Chapter 9. According to Cullmann the "others" in 4:38b who started the mission to Samaria were the early Hellenistic Christians who took refuge there after having been driven out of Jerusalem. He further suggests that Samaria is the scene of an historical connection between these Hellenists and "the Essene sect" which is known from the Qumran scrolls (p. 191). (This reviewer, however, challenges the idea that the Qumran community is an Essene sect in any specific sense.)

"Early Christianity and Civilization," Chapter 10, is an excellent essay on the relationship of Christianity to society and of the church to the state. He shows how primitive Christianity advocated neither asceticism nor complete surrender to the enjoyment of life. "To sum up: from the second century we find two kinds of divergence from apostolic teaching: a compromise with paganism, and asceticism. In neither case is the attitude to the world that enjoined by the apostolic faith" (p. 209).

Two of Cullmann's ideas which appear in several articles are unacceptable to me. One is the broad connotation which he gives to "scandal." Whereas in the New Testament "scandal" appears in the specific context of the problem of relating the cross to faith, Cullmann uses the same word to describe the problem of relating various books of the Bible to faith (p. 10) as well as to explain how the few years of apostolic history can be conceived of as "the centre and norm of the totality of time" (p. 76). This kind of free use of a specialized word seems to this reviewer to be inappropriate for an historical critic. The most objectionable concept, however, which I find is this: the Christian sacraments of Baptism and the

Lord's Supper take the place in the church of the miracles performed by Jesus Christ in the period of the incarnation (pp. 77, 99, 170, 172). It seems to me that this reads far too much into the sacraments.

Nevertheless, read this book for historical and theological insight and for personal edification.

—THOMAS BOSLOOPER

The Apostolic Fathers translated and edited by J. B. Lightfoot, edited and completed by J. R. Harmer, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. Pp. 288. \$3.95.

The writers closest on the heels of the apostles were the church fathers, the earliest of whom have been called the apostolic fathers. They lived and wrote in the first and second centuries. Their writings were rediscovered in the seventeenth century. The gift of Codex Alexandrinus to Charles I of England from the Patriarch of Constantinople was the impetus for the publication by Patrick Young in 1633 of the two epistles of Clement of Rome. Others of the apostolic fathers were put before the public in the next few years. In 1672 Jean Cotelier made the first collection, including the epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, and the Martyrdom of Polycarp.

By the latter half of the nineteenth century other works had obtained a place in the collection. The fragments of Papias and Quadratus and the Teachings of the Twelve Apostles, known as the Didache, were recognized as equally ancient and worthy of inclusion. A complete edition was edited jointly in Germany by Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, beginning in 1875. Joseph Barber Lightfoot began a similar work in English, publishing an exhaustive two-volume edition of Clement in 1869 and of Ignatius and Polycarp in three volumes in 1885 (second edition 1889). At his

death in 1889 he was preparing a second edition of Clement, which appeared the next year. Among his rough notes were found introductions and translations for other works of the apostolic fathers. J. R. Harmer brought these together in one volume with the translations and abridged introductions from Bishop Lightfoot's previous publications. He appended Keble's translation of the Reliques of the Elders Preserved in Ireneus with a few alterations. This handy edition of 1891 has been reprinted now by Baker Book House.

The translation is well done in this volume, attesting to the scholarship of Bishop Lightfoot. In style it uses a stately English much like the King James Version. For example, on page 80 (the Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians): "My brethren, my heart overfloweth altogether in love towards you; and rejoicing above measure I watch over your safety: yet not I, but Jesus Christ, wearing whose bonds I am the more afraid, because I am not yet perfected." Those who seek a translation in modern English may find it in Goodspeed, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Harper, 1950) or in volume I of the *Library of Christian Classics: Early Christian Fathers*, edited by Cyril C. Richardson (Westminster, 1953).

The introductions give the background of each work and list the sources for its text. Some new sources have been discovered and published since 1891, such as a third century Latin version of the genuine epistle of Clement and a fifth century Greek MS of the epistles of Ignatius, but the textual improvements from the new sources are comparatively few. Therefore the work of Lightfoot is still useful.

These subapostolic writings have their value in the study of church history and of the text and canon of the Old and New Testaments. The churches founded by the apostles faced their tasks and problems with courage in the face of great persecution during this period. They grew in influence and daughter churches were established in all parts of

the empire. The writers quoted freely from both Testaments. The quotations from the church fathers, especially those so close to the apostles, are of extreme importance in the establishment of the text, but they are often neglected. Some of the books, the Epistle of Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas in particular, were included in lists on canonical books before the Council of Nicea. From that height they fell to complete neglect for many centuries. It is time that they and the other apostolic fathers receive the study they warrant.

—SYLVIO J. SCORZA

The Presbyterian Enterprise, Edited by Maurice W. Armstrong, Leferts A. Loetscher, and Charles A. Anderson, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. Pp. 7-320. \$4.50.

The Story of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., by Benjamin J. Lake, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. Pp. 9-126. \$1.00.

The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is an American institution; and he who reads Presbyterian history reads also American history. The Presbyterian Church acted upon and was acted upon by the history of which she formed a part: the struggle for freedom and the Revolutionary War, the problem of slavery and the Civil War, the westward movement and its spirit of competition. The introduction of new ideas in the fields of politics, economics, sociology, science, and education can be traced in the history of the Presbyterian Church.

Primarily, of course, ecclesiastical history (for a creedal church) is theological history, and the theological history of a Reformed church is of great interest to all churches in that communion. It is with keen awareness that her problems are not unique that one reads the controversy regarding the significance and use of her confession of faith: the

attempts to make it narrow and the attempts to make it broad; the attempts to ignore its meaning and the attempts to enrich its meaning. For other Reformed churches whose unity has been disrupted, it makes instructive reading to examine the theological reasons Presbyterian churches have discovered for separation—and their theological basis for reunion. Her history also reveals the theology that underlies her programs of education, of missions, and of social action.

Her history is presented in these two books in two distinct ways. The book by Benjamin J. Lake is a paper bound, pocket size history for the Presbyterian layman. It does not pretend to be a scholarly approach to history; it does not even bother with an index. It is a smoothly written, brief account of the denomination's history to be read and enjoyed at a single sitting. The popular standing it will enjoy among laymen should encourage other denominations to produce something like it.

The work edited by Armstrong, *et. al.*, is a scholarly work. It brings together into a single volume carefully selected original source material out of the history of the Presbyterian Church. The editorial comment that binds the sources together is to the point and places the best interpretation on the motives behind a movement or faction.

This *is* history; it is not *about* history. Here is found the text of such frequently cited sources (not easily available to the ordinary student) as the Adopting Act of 1729, Gilbert Tennent's sermon "The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry," the "Auburn Affirmation," and "A Letter to Presbyterians."

The interested student of history will discover a thrill in studying original sources that he does not find in reading ordinary history books. He will feel that he is making his own examination of history and discovering his own interpretation of it. This can be subtly deluding, of course, for the selection of material by editors inevitably directs the reader's "discoveries."

Moreover, a documentary presentation of history tends to suggest as an interpretation of history that "whatever ultimately happened, whatever forces ultimately won out, these were the best." Unless the historical account is to stop when the curtain comes down on a dramatic incident in history or when a group with a special theological emphasis leaves the main body of the denomination, there is no way to avoid this difficulty. The editors of this volume have done an excellent job of mitigating it by choosing selections which present the best of both sides of a controversy.

Both of these books will support the proposition that "history is never dead."

—WILLIAM W. JELLEMA

The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, by Norman H. Snaith, New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. Pp. 203. \$2.50.

That the intertestamentary period is an altogether too unfamiliar one to most of us is fact which should disturb us. As the author points out in his introduction, this period was the cradle of three world religions: Judaism, Christianity, Islam. This period marks the milieu into which Christ was born—acquaintance with which usually terminates abruptly in the political sphere just beyond a passing recognition of Caesar and Herod; in the religious realm after stereotyping the "world into which Jesus came" as a Palestine in the grips of Pharisaic legalism and hypocrisy. To those of us who acknowledge a lack of information on these times, or whose understanding of such has been hampered by confusing, laborious presentations in other sources this book by Snaith makes a welcome appearance.

The author is principal and tutor of Old Testament and Hebrew, Wesley College, Leeds, England. Dr. Snaith is the author of more than twenty books dealing mainly with Old Testament subjects, and of "The Language of the

Old Testament" (Volume I) and "Introduction and Exegesis of I and II Kings" (Volume III) of *The Interpreters Bible*.

This book is a study of the political history and religious development of the Jewish people during the five centuries preceding the birth of Jesus. To judge this work on the basis of a comparison of it with the larger, standard works in this field is both unfair and uncalled for. Snaith makes clear that "an attempt has been made to streamline everything, to provide the minimum of exact and detailed knowledge which will make the trend of events and the development of ideas plain and intelligible." (Introd.) Herein lies the genius of this work. Whereas other standard volumes in this area are apt to leave all but the most capable analysts with an unwieldy mass of data, one finds that this book leaves him with trends and developments in more of a "nut-shell." It would make easier and more profitable a delving into the more exhaustive studies of R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*; E. Schurer, *History of the Jewish People*, et. al., for those who so desire.

Part I, pp. 7-61, is a treatment of the historical development from the rise of Cyrus during the Exile down to the time of Herod and the birth of Christ. In depicting the rise and fall of emperors and empires, Snaith has an intriguing "come-on" style of narrative which keeps the pages open before the reader. He makes some fertile interpretations about the impact of the history of neighboring nations to biblical history: (e.g., the genesis of the aim and method of Alexander the Great and its consequence in the world of Asia Minor; the importance of the sub-servient policy in preserving Judah as a kingdom, etc.) The chief value of this part is its concise, orderly presentation of intertestamentary political history.

Part II, pp. 62-203, deals with the religious development during the same period, covering such topics as "Separatism," "Life After Death," "Messiah,"

"Logos," "Temple and Synagogue," and others. Higher critics in the "conservative" camp will note and probably take issue with some conclusions of Snaith: (e.g., his definite identification of the Servant of the Lord with the exiles of 597 B.C.—p. 67; the implications of his Second Isaiah hypothesis in a work of this nature, as well as the later dating of "pre-exilic prophets and writings" pp. 75, 76.) However, such should not deter any from reading this second part which is also marked by some fresh insights into the messages of the prophets plus some good exegetical excerpts of various Old Testament passages.

—JOHN E. BUSMAN

The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr, by Hans Hofmann, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956. Pp. viii-269. \$3.95.

Reinhold Niebuhr, as everyone should know, is Professor of Applied Christianity at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. He is the author of scores of books, essays, articles and pamphlets. Contrary to popular opinion, he is not a theologian in the primary sense of that word. His main interest lies in the area of Christian ethics and it is there that his mark has been made. Nevertheless, since ethics and theology are intimately allied in Niebuhr's thought, he is widely recognized as one of the major theologians of our time. Prof. Hans Hofmann of Princeton Theological Seminary has written a book about this distinguished preacher and scholar. It is a work that bids fair to become one of the best critical sketches available on the thinking of Niebuhr.

The purpose of Hofmann's volume is to demonstrate the inner unity of Niebuhr's thought and to bring the reader to a more enlightening and fruitful study of Niebuhr's writings. The author has succeeded admirably in carrying out this purpose. He has placed us in his debt. Moreover, he drives us back to Niebuhr. The Christian Church has

not taken this contemporary prophet as seriously as the world has taken him. No minister worth his salt can any longer afford to neglect or spurn Niebuhr. Hofmann's study makes this manifest and final.

Hofmann shows Niebuhr to be analytical in his approach to theology. This analytical approach begins with a critique of the human predicament. It includes an expose of the limitations, expectations and illusions of man as a creature immersed in the flux of history and moves on to a demonstration of man's need for the Word of grace, forgiveness and fulfillment that comes to him from beyond. Niebuhr is a kind of apologist for the Christian faith but not an apologist in the traditional sense. He does not proceed by constructing proofs for the truth of Christianity. His procedure, rather, is to show that the human situation is such as to demand the Christian message for its solution.

Niebuhr appears to some to be defeatist and pessimistic. A condemnation of secular optimism regarding the possibilities of history runs through most of his writing; he shows that both Greek and modern estimates of the uniqueness of man are defective; he stresses original sin to a generation which has been confident of its innate goodness; he criticizes man for the pride that leads him to think more highly than he ought to think; he censures religion for fostering the type of pietism that manifests itself in philanthropy rather than in concern for social and economic justice.

Hofmann's analysis of Niebuhr reveals that pessimism and defeat do not have the last word in his thought. Niebuhr believes in the relevance of the Christian ethic to society; he is convinced that the Kingdom of God is related to the struggle for justice, that a closer approximation to the good society is always an historical possibility; that grace enables man to achieve what he is incapable of achieving by his own strength; that God himself long ago took up the search for lost man and that

he has spoken a decisive Word in Christ; that the world is worth saving and that neither individual man nor society needs to fall into despair as if there is no hope.

Niebuhr considers himself primarily the preacher and only secondarily the scholar. He has arrived at his insights not as much through study as through the pressure of world events. No simple moral homilies decorate his preaching. While a pastor in Detroit many years ago, he saw that moralistic preaching was "irrelevant to the brutal facts of life in a great industrial center." His preaching is always an attempt to relate the church and world in ways that will do full justice to the vitality of Christianity without underestimating the realities of power, disorder and injustice with which the world continually abounds. The Christianity of Niebuhr is no sentimental religiosity and the world he knows teems with demonic possibilities. Both church and world exist under the God who is both Judge and Redeemer. This God exhibits both justice and mercy but his mercy, in the final analysis, always transcends his justice.

Very helpful in Hofmann's book is a clarification of Niebuhr's usage of the term "myth" and the difference between Bultmann's and Niebuhr's use of that term. Another useful feature of the volume is a bibliography of the writings of Niebuhr. This bibliography, even so, makes no pretensions at being complete. The one contained in the Kegley and Bretall volume on Niebuhr in *The Library of Living Theology, Vol. II*, is more exhaustive. The definitive bibliography of Niebuhr's writings was prepared several years ago by a man named Roberts, a member of the staff at Berea College. This was a valuable service because of Niebuhr's almost unlimited productivity and because he has kept no record of his own publications.

The volume reviewed in these paragraphs is recommended without stint to the readers of *The Reformed Review*.

—JOHN A. VANDER WAAL

The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, by George S. Hendry, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. Pp. 128. \$2.50.

This is the first book from the scholarly Scottish pastor who became professor of theology at Princeton Seminary a few years ago. To use the author's own words, "This book does not pretend to offer a systematic doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Its purpose is merely to direct attention to certain doctrinal problems in this area which have emerged in recent theological thought."

Here then is a volume treating certain aspects of the subject of the Holy Spirit. It is not a quick summary of the doctrine of the Spirit, nor is it a homiletical crutch on the same. It is a competent and important study intended for careful students.

Believing that "the real core of many controversial issues is the implied doctrine of the Holy Spirit," Professor Hendry treats five such problems. The subject is examined in these five relationships: the Holy Spirit and Christ, God, the Church, the Word, and the human spirit. Hendry further treats his subject in what he calls the chronological order, rather than the canonical order. That is, he takes up the relationships as they developed in the history of doctrine, "the order in which the problems engaged the attention of the Church." This explains why he begins with the Holy Spirit and Christ, rather than the Old Testament. Hendry asserts that the witness of the New Testament to the gift of the Spirit is soteriological and eschatological, and therefore it loses something distinctive when presented in some other order.

This author points out properly the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Christ in his person and work, and the relationship between the Spirit and the individual's experience of Christ. He says, "The Spirit is presented in a purely Christocentric reference. There is no reference in the New Testament to any work of the Spirit apart from

Christ. The Spirit is, in an exclusive sense, the Spirit of Christ." He then goes on to explain that we may speak of an activity of the Spirit before the advent of Christ because that activity is related to the advent of Christ prophetically or proleptically. As for man, the Spirit is always a gift that comes from God and testifies to the human spirit of the salvation God has wrought in Christ.

Hendry goes on to the relationship between the Spirit and God and suggests that there is a functional or dynamic identity between the Spirit and the Son, and ultimately, the Father: The Father is present and active in the Son, and the Son in the Spirit.

In discussing the subject of the Spirit and the Church Hendry points out how the doctrine of the Church is linked with our conception of the Spirit, and in turn with our doctrine of Christ. He treats the three major views, Romanist, Protestant, and Enthusiast or Spiritualist. He concludes by noting that by correlating the Spirit and the Word the Protestant view maintains both the centrality of the Incarnation and the lordship of the Spirit.

The chapter on the Spirit and the Word is both illuminating and stimulating. Hendry gives some of us pause in stating the work of the Spirit in inspiring the Word. He reminds us that the main insight of the Reformation was that faith is a personal relation with God in Christ through the Spirit, and that all else, the Church, Bible, sacraments, etc., are means to that end. Whenever any of these mediating factors become ends in themselves, faith is depersonalized and protest is in order. The author suggests that the development of the theory of inspiration was a betrayal of the Reformation at this point. Here is something for many of us to ponder carefully!

The final chapter deals with the question of what role can be assigned man in the encounter with the gospel that will not conflict with the sovereignty of grace, yet will conserve man's essential humanity. Hendry meets this

question with the ideas of condescension and accommodation in grace. In the incarnation God condescends to man, but still respects him as man; he does not "un-man" him. The Holy Spirit does not destroy man's freedom, but changes it into the true freedom, the "glorious liberty of the children of God."

Here is a book worth time and study, a book not designed to feed directly into sermons, but to stimulate one's thinking and exercise his insights. It indicates its author's grasp of the Biblical material and the historical development of the subject of the Holy Spirit.

—DANIEL H. FYLSTRA

Christelijke Zielszorg in het Licht der Moderne Psychologie (Christian Care of the Soul in the Light of Modern Psychology), by G. Brillenburg Wurth, Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1955. Pp. 332.

Dr. G. Brillenburg Wurth is a professor in the theological school of the Gereformeerde Kerk in Kampen, the Netherlands. This book seeks to set forth some of the implications of modern psychological studies in their relation to the work of the church and particularly of the pastor. This book very ably performs its purpose. The author seeks to set forth some of the newest developments in psychological research. This is not at all exhaustive but it represents a very readable survey of trends. The author emphasizes the pastor's point of view. This we need in books on pastoral work today. It would compare favorably in style to such books as Blackwood, *Pastoral Work*, and Oates, *The Christian Pastor*. Above everything else, however, one appreciates the Reformed point of view evident in this work and the emphasis laid on institutions and practices peculiar to our Reformed churches. The book is divided into four main sections: I. Historical; II. Orientation; III. Principle; IV. Practical.

Section I, the Historical section, traces the history of the care of the soul from the time before Christ (Old Testament) very briefly, the time of Christ and his apostles, the age of the Roman Catholic Church and the time after the Reformation.

Section II, the section dealing with orientation, or an acquaintance with the basic matters involved, traces the modern trends in psychology and psychoanalysis with special reference to the concepts of such men as Freud, Adler and Jung. Also the import of these ideas on such men as Kierkegaard, Barth and Brunner in their dialectical theologies and existentialist philosophies is traced. This section is necessarily brief and admittedly not exhaustive. I find such a book as Weatherhead's, *Psychology, Religion, and Healing* more helpful at this point. The final chapter of this section deals with a discussion of such concepts as: the unconscious and subconscious (*onbewuste, onderbewuste*); the passions; moods; suggestion; the problem of the physical (psycho-somatic), and our relationships to others.

Section III is entitled, Principle section (*Principeel*). There is a discussion here of the import of the pastoral office. The offices of prophet, priest, preacher and pastor all belong together. They have important bearing upon one another. The preacher in the pulpit ought always to be the pastor. The importance of the elder's office is constantly emphasized. In a wider sense every believer ought to be concerned about the care of the soul. "Am I my brother's keeper?"—Indeed! The task of soul care is also a task of the church, the body of Christ (*gemeente*). In many places this concern falls away because the church is too large. We need fellowship and the sense of belonging. At the same time we need to reemphasize the rights of the individual person. House visitation assists in discovering the needs of individuals. Even there one is led to realize the need of individual interview and personal help. There is

also a discussion on *contact*. To speak to an individual is not necessarily to understand him. We need to meet each other in reciprocal willingness to share and to listen. This requires love.

"Without love a genuine man-to-man conversation is impossible. And without love a pastoral contact is doomed to failure" (p. 155).

We must all learn to see men as complete, unified individuals, i.e., every realm of experience has a bearing on his problem. A warning here is well taken. Always the pastor deals with men as a pastor. Although he may know something of psychology and psychoanalysis, he is not trying to practice as a psychologist or psychiatrist. This is important. Let the pastor realize his limitations!

Section IV is entitled the Practical section and deals with such problems as spiritual growth, the problem of doubt, sin, hardship, sickness, death, the problems of day by day existence and the problem of the pastor himself. There is an excellent discussion here of the matter of conversion. Revivalism emphasizes puberty as the period of conversion. The negative aspect must not be neglected, however, it may also be the period of the loss of those principles and teachings instilled from childhood. In dealing with sin one must seek to deal in understanding. Every sin is against God, but all sins are not necessarily on the same level for treatment and understanding. The sin of alcoholism is discussed with emphasis on the need for psychiatric treatment. The pastor need not be afraid to admit that to many problems he himself has no answer. We cannot present a well thought out and reasonable theodicy. In many respects there are and remain unanswerable questions. There is a discussion of the pastor's work with the sick, the chronically ill and the mentally ill. Many practical suggestions are given for dealing with the sick. There is also a chapter on the ministry to the dying. Finally the writer suggests that every pastor needs to remember his own need

and must daily seek prayerful fellowship with Jesus Christ.

For those who can read Dutch this book is a real treasure. This is something we need also today from the Reformed point of view for ministers of the Word in our churches. It is well worth while to gain a reading knowledge of Dutch for the sake of such books as these and others coming from the universities of the Netherlands.

—JEROME DE JONG

Fifteen Hundred Themes for Series Preaching, by William Goolooze, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1956. Pp. V-156. \$2.50.

R. W. Dale, the scholarly British preacher of the nineteenth century, said of books on preaching, "Some men speak contemptuously of lectures on preaching and treatises on the science and art of rhetoric. For myself, I have read scores of books of this kind, and I have never read one without finding in it some useful suggestion. I advise you to read every book on preaching that you can buy or borrow."

This is a useful book on preaching and the man in the pastorate who must prepare messages from week to week will find in it many helpful suggestions particularly for developing continuity in his preaching.

Dr. Goolooze, before his untimely death in the Fall of 1955, had taught for some years, in the Department of Practical Theology at Western Seminary but previous to that had established himself in the pastorate as an outstanding preacher. Dr. Goolooze put the major emphasis in his ministry on preaching in series. This book is the result, therefore, of a lifetime of preaching and teaching.

The book is divided into thirteen chapters, each of which discusses a different kind of series around which sermons can be developed. Three of them deal with the Christian Year; Lent, Easter, and Advent. Others deal with more general types of sermons in series

and are called, "Word Connected Series," "Idea Connected Series," and "Nature Series."

The major portion of the book is devoted to listing the titles and texts of these sermons. There are actually fifteen hundred sermon titles and texts in this book! One of the practical values of the book is that each text is printed out in full so that the person using the book can read the text without looking up each reference in the Bible. There are no sermon outlines for this is not the purpose of the book. The general topic of the series is given and then all the separate titles with the texts.

The book also contains an eight-page introduction, outlining some suggestions for writing sermons in series and each series is introduced with a brief introductory paragraph explaining the different types of sermon series.

—HENRY BAST

I've Been Wondering, by Fayly H. Cothorn, Fort Worth, Texas: Broadman Press, 1956. Pp. ix-121. \$1.75.

The questions in this little book are from actual letters written by teen-agers who want to live a more abundant, Christian life. The contents were first published under the title, "I've Been Wondering," as a feature of *Upward*, a Southern Baptist weekly publication for teen-agers.

The book is divided into four parts: I. "I've Been Wondering About Dating," II. "I've Been Wondering About Parents," III. "I've Been Wondering About Social Matters," IV. "I've Been Wondering About Spiritual Matters." The numerous questions under each division naturally cover a wide range of subjects.

The writer has a conservative answer for many questions asked continually by teen-agers. When questions can be treated by the direct Christian approach, the author does so effectively. Positive answers are given such questions as, "How

old should I be to start dating?" and "Should I date a person who drinks?" In replying to questions regarding parents, such as "Are parents always right?" and "What about unsaved parents?"; the answers are often supported with quotations from Scripture. Sound advice and sensible solutions are offered concerning the common problems of Sunday activities, smoking, drinking, dancing—"knowing what to do and what not to do." The writer sounds a fine spiritual note in replying to the queries, "Should I belong to the church?", "How does one find the will of God for his life?", "Should I fear the end of the world?" and others of a like nature.

The book covers lighter questions as well, and all are answered in style and language understandable to young people. The book is interesting and could be read with profit not only by teenagers but also by parents and leaders of young people. The subject matter reveals the serious and practical thinking done by teen-agers in the major areas of their lives and offers helpful Christian solutions to their problems.

—JERRY A. VELDMAN

Luke the Physician, by William M. Ramsay, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. Pp. v-418. \$4.50.

Toward the end of the last century, when the historicity of Acts had been largely discredited by the Tübingen school, Luke found an unexpected champion in Sir William Ramsay. Approaching Acts on the assumption that it was a middle second-century fabrication, Ramsay's archaeologist's spade drove him to the conclusion that it was indeed the first-century work of an extraordinarily reliable historian. History, geography, archaeology, and the faith of a Scottish layman combined in him to produce a sizable literature on Paul, Asia Minor, and the early church.

Luke the Physician is something of a Ramsay sampler. Its twelve unrelated

chapters, or articles, fall into the general areas of New Testament Introduction and the History of Religion. In addition to Luke and the synoptic problem, articles in the former category concern aspects of New Testament chronology, research, geography, language, and provenance.

The title chapter (actually a critical review of A. von Harnack's *Lukas der Arzt*, 1906) outlines Ramsay's views on the historical trustworthiness of Acts, the unity of authorship of Luke-Acts, the fundamental Hellenism of Luke's Christianity, and the now widely accepted South Galatia theory. Most useful to the preacher would be "St. Paul's Use of Metaphors from Greek and Roman Life." This article demonstrates how in contrast with the common nature imagery of the Bible, Paul's favorite figures belonged to the market, the stadium, the athletic field, and other areas of urban life. In Chapter XI, "The Date and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," the author espouses a theory that Hebrews was the joint production of Paul and the Church at Caesarea during the apostle's imprisonment there in A.D. 59. Addressed to the Jewish party in the Church at Jerusalem, it purposes to heal the breach existing between it and Paul. Since recent scholarship has revived the possibilities of an early date and a Jewish destination of the letter, Ramsay's theory stands as one more suggested solution to this New Testament riddle.

The articles dealing with the History of Religion contain some valuable source material for the student of the early church. Firmly based on the author's first-hand study of archaeology and inscriptions, they shed welcome light on the geography, history, and religion of Asia Minor. Richest of all is Chapter XII on "The Church of Lycaonia in the Fourth Century." Some three dozen plates and figures enhance the interest of these articles.

Despite these strong points, however, this reprint is plagued with serious shortcomings. Book reviews, which hard-

ly qualify as permanent literature, constitute more than one-third of its chapters. While Harnack's *Lukas der Arzt* and G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* will profit students for years to come, the same cannot be said of their reviews. Equally distressing is the fact that the passing years have dated much of the material. There is too much poking in the cold ashes of yesterday's burning issues. With regard to Acts, Luke's historical ability has been largely vindicated. In the case of the synoptic problem, source criticism has surrendered the stage to Form Criticism. As to the present value of "A Criticism of Recent Research regarding the New Testament" written in 1908, nothing more need be said. In short, a sizable portion of *Luke the Physician* now belongs to the history of New Testament criticism.

—JAMES I. COOK

The Reformed Pulpit. Vol. 1, Grand Rapids: Society For Reformed Publications, 1956. Pp. 145. \$2.00.

The Reformed Pulpit is a book of fourteen sermons written by as many Reformed Church ministers. The aim of the book is stated in the introduction as an attempt to call attention to the Reformed pulpit.

Since the book is a collection of fourteen different sermons it is difficult to be specific in reviewing it. One sermon might appeal to one reader and another sermon might appeal to another reader. As I read each sermon I attempted to grade it as to content, style, simplicity, and interest. This grading resulted in

rating five sermons as good; four sermons as better; and five sermons as best.

The greatest disappointment that most readers will find in reading the book is that the sermons are not distinctly Reformed. They are without question evangelical and Biblical but because most of the sermons are expository sermons and not necessarily doctrinal they are not specifically Reformed. At least the authors fail to relate the truth of the text to Reformed doctrine.

Other than the first two sermons, which give a question and answer from the Heidelberg Catechism, sermon eleven is the only one that relates the truth of the text to a distinct Reformed doctrine. In this sermon entitled: "Social Implications of the Reformed Faith" the author takes the familiar story of the Good Samaritan and gives it new punch and power by grounding it in the great Reformed doctrine of the Sovereignty of God.

The Society might improve on its second volume if instead of expository sermons they would select doctrinal sermons. Many of our people would, I believe, welcome a book of simple sermons on such subjects as: "The Reformed Teaching on the Lord's Supper"; "The Covenant"; "Infant Baptism"; "Why We Worship on Sunday"; etc. Our people hear sermons on these subjects but they could profitably study them in their homes.

As a book of general sermons I would recommend the book to our ministers and laymen. Whether it meets the purpose stated in the introduction is in my mind doubtful.

—CHESTER J. DROOG

t
s
e
e
e

,
n
r-
h
c-
al
"
of
w
in
v-

ec-
ry
er-
I
ole
he
ap-
ap-
";
ese
udy

I
in-
the
in

G